

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1919.

THE SCHERIA OF THE *ODYSSEY*.

II.

I NOW turn to an examination of the grounds for arguing supernaturalism in the Phaeacian story, but for their proper appreciation it is necessary to consider an element in the narrative which unfortunately has had little attention of recent years. There is in it more than mere unseasoned description. The poet is evidently taking off these settlers in Scheria, the centre about which his humour plays being the figure of their king, Alkinoos. This is no new thing, but all, as Blass once silyly remarked of a scene in the *Iliad*, do not perceive it. It was clear to Mure. On pp. 404 sqq. of Vol. I. of his *Hist. of Gk. Lit.* he describes the fun at length, deplores the misapprehension by 'profound commentators,' and thinks the episode 'the most brilliant specimen of the poet's combined talent for the delineation of character and for satirical humour.' See also Samuel Butler's *The Humour of Homer*. No one was better qualified than Butler for such an appreciation; the pity is that he spoiled it all by his great Homeric joke about Nausikaa's authorship. Some points are noticed by Perrin and Hayman, and Trenkel sees that the community is *Gegenstand des Spottes*. But generally the humour is lost on the commentators, who, intent only on the jigsawing of the Phaeacian story, mark the *uerborum minutiae* and are blind to the *rerum pondera*.

Alkinoos appears to be a hearty old sea-dog, well-to-do, and proud of his prosperous people. His speeches show him vain and egotistical. This is apparent from the recurrence in them of *ἐγώ* and its parts and derivatives, and from his references to the *ἀρετή* of his Phaeacians, who are to him *ἀμύμονες* and 'excel all others.' 'Self-laudatory bombast,' Mure says, is the chief characteristic of his discourses. He is also impulsive and downright, promising convoy to the stranger—who might, λ 363 sqq., have been *ἡπεροπενὺς καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπὸς*!—after an hour's acquaintance, and even suggesting that he should take Nausikaa to wife. He seems to be of a simple mind—*ἀπλοϊκὸς μάλιστα εἰσάγεται*, schol. η 313—and apt to be careless as to the discharge of his public duties, η 159 sqq., and λ 346. In the latter case, when called to order,

he is alert at once, and is ready to comply if Heaven give him one more day to live.

And he is fond of the feast and loves οἶνω πνεύμονα τέγγειν. This helps to explain his speeches. His own daughter's words, when he is first introduced, are surely significant, τῷ (θρόνῳ) ὃ γε οἶνοποτάζει ἐφήμενος ἀθάνατος ὥς—as if draining the winecup were his habitual occupation and τὸ πίνειν τὸ ζῆν. Trenkel goes so far as to attribute to him the *Stimmung einer seligen Zechers*. Some critics might have saved themselves trouble over discrepancies had they noticed that the speeches which they were dissecting were made by the king when the wine was in. Thus in η he and his nobles are introduced to us at dinner, πίνοντες καὶ ἔδοντες, and it is just after the company has broken up that he makes the proposal of marriage already mentioned, with a suddenness which surprises Nitzsch. Yet further experience of the king's way after a good meal makes it clear that he sometimes in such circumstances ἐπος προέειπεν ὃ πέρ τ' ἄρρητον ἄμεινον. These circumstances recur the very next day. At the banquet the minstrel's song moves Odysseus to tears, and Alkinoos, noticing this, proposes an adjournment for games, but is unfortunately led on to swagger about the prowess of his performers—ἡ τοίνυν τοῦτο ἀλαζονεύεται, Eustath. a.l. His guest shall see them and be able to proclaim to his friends, ὅσσον περιγυγνόμεθ' ἄλλων | πύξ τε παλαιμοσύνη τε καὶ ἄλμασιν ἠδὲ πόδεσσιν, θ 102 sq. The games proceed, and there are displays in all the four sports mentioned, the victor in boxing being his own son Laodamas. Next comes the interlude in which Odysseus, displeased at the challenge from Laodamas¹ and roused by the insulting words of another performer, hurls a discus in a style that astonishes the assemblage. He then, in the heat of victory, offers to engage all comers in any contest, excepting only running, for which, after his experiences in the sea, he does not feel very fit. The effect of this is to sober Alkinoos at once. He must prevent the stranger from shaming them all, especially after his own boast, so he makes an apology for the rudeness, and then in the silliest manner possible and still with a vanity that refuses to be suppressed, makes a complete change of front. The stranger is carefully to mark the king's words, so that—once again—he may be able to tell of the ἀρετή of the Phaeacians, and is now to hear the true manner of it. They are not, in this revised version, πύγμαχοι at all! They love the feast and dance and other luxuries. But above all they excel in the dance. Odysseus shall see for himself, and—yet again—tell his friends how the Phaeacians 'beat everybody' ναυτιλίῃ καὶ ποσσὶ καὶ ὀρχηστῇ καὶ αἰοιδῇ. One notes especially the ποσσί. It is the only reference to athletics, and is the one contest in which Odysseus had said he would not compete, and which his host was quite safe in mentioning. He falls back on music and the dance

¹ I have not seen a reason suggested for Laodamas' behaviour. Is it that he was sore at having had to give up his place of honour by his father the night before? If so, there is a parallel given by Wagner-Anson, *Epics and*

Romances of the Middle Ages, 21. Similarly, the apology for the insult and the amende by the gift of a sword are paralleled, *ibid.* 353, in Beowulf.

and his
a self-co
on the p
account
may add
θ 22 sq.
Odysseus
especially

The
the critic
vindicated
ball-play
Alkinoos
vanity is
childish c
μάλα μοι
Such solid
each to p
includes h
unreasona
contribution

Later

tunity for
attention a
That will
πάνυ τολμ
his ships s
digression.
that the P
trouble yet
who would
the usual f
θεὸς τελέσει
exalted mo
ἐπλετο θυμῷ
provide.' S
enjoy them
a quiet min
burning. E
Bavardage i
cheer. Nitz

The king
setting hims
excepted. M

and his ships, and there he is on firm ground. His explanation involves a self-contradiction which has offended the critics. See for a recent statement on the point Mr. Paton in *C.R.* XXVI. 215 sq. The argument there takes no account of the character in which the poet presents Alkinoos. He notices, I may add, the standing difficulty of ὥς κεν . . . ἐκτελέσειεν ἀέθλους πολλούς in *θ* 22 sq. If it is not resolved by Merry and Riddell *a.l.*—the discus was Odysseus' 'discharge in full'—see the subsequent lines 146 sqq., 154, 184, and especially 205 sqq.

The narrative proceeds. Demodocus sings the famous Lay, on which the critics have expended so much adverse comment, and which Mr. Paton vindicates as old and genuine. There is then an exhibition of dancing and ball-play à deux, which moves Odysseus to a warm compliment. The effect on Alkinoos is instantaneous. 'With ravish'd ears the monarch hears.' His vanity is pleased, he has disposed of a dangerous performer, and he turns with childish delight to his audience. The stranger is really a man of sense—*μάλα μοι δοκῇ πεπνυμένος εἶναι*—and able to appreciate outstanding ἀρετή! Such solid discernment must not go unrewarded, so the nobles are ordered each to present Odysseus with fine raiment and a talent of gold. Alkinoos includes himself, and Butler will have it that in the event the king, whom he unreasonably describes as 'out at elbows,' conveniently forgets his own money contribution. He appears, however, to contribute a golden cup in substitution.

Later there is more feasting, but Alkinoos does not get another opportunity for distinguishing himself till Odysseus' tears once more compel his attention as *rex conuiuii*. There is first the extraordinary praise of his ships. That will be considered presently. Eustathius was right when he said οὕτω πᾶν τολμᾷ ὁ Ὀμηρικὸς Ἀλκίνοος τερατεύεσθαι. But the further claim that his ships sail the sea in perfect safety leads to a delicious ending to the digression. As he boasts, he suddenly remembers an old saying of his father's that the Phaeacians' weakness for conveying strangers would get them into trouble yet, and that one day a ship so engaged would be wrecked by Poseidon, who would also in his wrath surround the city with a mountain. We expect the usual formula of pious deprecation of an evil chance, such as *μὴ τοῦτο θεὸς τελέσειε οἱ μὴ τοῦτο φίλον Διὶ πατρὶ γένοιτο*. Not so from Alkinoos in his exalted mood, but *τὰ δέ κεν θεὸς ἢ τελέσειεν, | ἢ κ' ἀτέλεστ' εἴη, ὥς οἱ φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ*. So the devil may take the future; we 'take the good the gods provide.' Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. For the present let them enjoy themselves, and Alkinoos resumes his inquiries of the stranger with a quiet mind. The whole scene is consistent, but it has caused much heart-burning. Even Bérard would cut out the passage as *bavardage insupportable*. *Bavardage* it is, but just what we expect from the king when warmed by good cheer. Nitzsch's *heitere Prahlerei* is a quite appropriate description.

The king is evidently the chief butt of the humour of the poet when setting himself to make fun of the society as a whole—the ladies, however, excepted. Mure goes so far as to say the women 'engross the small stock of

common sense allotted to the community,' and certainly those brought on the stage seem to be intended as foils to the male actors. Areté is a noble figure, and Nausikaa, by common consent, one of the most charming and lovable figures in all literature. But, apart from the presentation of Alkinoos, there are numerous touches which indicate a spirit of irony. The athletic exhibition of this easy-going community of sailors is described almost as seriously as the **Ἀθλα* of the *Iliad*.¹ The poet obviously repeats his own phraseology. He even exceeds it when he applies to the wrestler Euryalus the epithet *βροτολοιγῷ ἴσος Ἀρηϊ*! When he says of the same athlete, *ἄριστος ἔην εἰδὸς τε δέμας τε πάντων Φαίηκων μετ' ἁμύμονα Λαοδάμαντα*, we can hardly fail to recall the comparison between two somewhat greater heroes, Achilles and Aias. Pointed again is the effect of Odysseus' throw on the crowd of Phaeacians. As the discus hurtles through the air, they crouch to the ground, not because the discus comes near them, but apparently alarmed by the mere noise—*λαὸς ὑπὸ ῥιπῆς*—and awestruck by the performance of a real *ἀθλητήρ*, and the poet seizes the occasion, when the wind, so to speak, has been taken out of the Phaeacian sails, to give them their full high-sounding style and title of *Φαίηκες δολιχίηρετμοι, ναυσίκληντοι ἄνδρες*. All the preparations for the *pièce de résistance*, the dance brought on after the *éclat* of the athletic performance had been sadly marred by that horrid discus, are conceived in the same vein. The line, *αἰσυνμῆται δὲ κριτοὶ ἐννέα πάντες ἀνέστησαν*,² recalls the similar one in the *Iliad* telling how the Achaean chiefs rose to accept Hector's challenge; the preparation of the *χόρος*, the marking off of the lists in Γ 315; while the ball thrown about in the dance is duly ascribed to its maker, like the great shield of Aias, or the chair of state, *δινωτὴ ἐλέφαντι καὶ ἀργύρῳ*, in which Penelopé was wont to sit. But this their own pet display, the last infirmity of the noble Phaeacians, has a grace of its own and extorts the praise of Odysseus. The effect of the praise on the jolly monarch has already been noted. His is a temperament easily affected. There is satire in his name—the 'Strong of Intellect' (Mure), or 'Prowess-minded' (Perrin). But it should be noted that those of the supernaturalists who equate Phaeacia with the *Unterwelt* think it a splendid name for a stern lord of the infernal regions. Osterwald's *Starkherz* is yet another name for him who even in antiquity was *Κρόνου πολυώνυμος υἱός*.

The conclusion that the poet is, in Butler's phrase, quietly laughing in his sleeve, is not to be resisted. The motive underlying the delicate pasquinade we shall never know with certainty, but the fact has to be borne in mind in all interpretations of the *Phäakis* and inferences from its language. That the quiet raillery has been so seldom detected is due to the fact that criticism has been obsessed by the supernatural prejudice, and by the *Modekrankheit*, which left no room for appreciation of the poet's aims, that the episode is a patch-

¹ Jobst in a *Program*, Passau, 1909, compares the two Tournaments. After excising in each case what he deems spurious, he finds much that is common to the two narratives.

² I should now take stronger ground than I did in *C.Q.* VII. 234 sqq. in regard to some of the cases relied on by Monro.

work of
idea or
Lande.
any sec
the stay
it! Th
discour
But to g
I can o
tribute
πλεῖστος

Let
first rea
They are
Alkinoos
accustom
bodily f
ἐγγύθεν
two wor
which gi
take bot
including
But in th
a local s
seemed t
gods.' C
The islan
Achaean
no need t
sense of
them, is t
e 378, in
alone. R
proper, af
Confining
Πελασγοί.
it be taken
Greek epi
wander ab
γ 420, 375
nothing o
individual

¹ The onl
the early ep
use there gi

work of the remains of a number of poems or stories of different ages. That idea originated, and was mainly pursued, in Germany, 'dem klassischen Lande,' to use Rothe's expression, 'der philologischen Zergliederungen.' If any section of the epics is a finely finished whole, it is this delightful tale of the stay of Odysseus in Scheria. And yet the hash that has been made of it! The process still goes on—*insano iuuat indulgere labori*, in spite of the discouragement such principles have received even in the land of their birth. But to give an account of the dissection of the *Phäakis* is beyond my scope. I can only, with Miss Stawell, *op. cit.* 141 sqq., pay to such sacrilege the tribute of a sigh—in Pindar's words, *τυφλὸν δ' ἔχει ἥτορ ὁμιλὸς ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος*.

Let us now consider the grounds for the various fairyland theories. The first reason is that the Phaeacians have a close connexion with the gods. They are *ἀγχίθεοι* in the repeated line ε 35=τ 279. Further, in η 205 sqq., Alkinoos, speaking after dinner, and 'at his best,' tells Odysseus that they are accustomed to divine appearances at sacrifice, and even to meeting gods in bodily form. In the latter case the gods οὐ τι κατακρύπτουσιν, ἐπεὶ σφισιν ἐγγύθεν εἰμέν, like the Cyclopes or those wild beings, the Gigantes. On these two words, *ἀρχίθεοι*¹ and *ἐγγύθεν*, see the note of Merry and Riddell on η 205, which gives the gist of the matter. And I find the commentators generally take both expressions as 'nearly related to the gods,' which the Phaeacians, including their royal family, certainly were by their descent from Poseidon. But in that there is nothing unusual. The alternative view, taking *ἐγγύθεν* in a local sense, is that the Phaeacians are among 'those distant nations who seemed to dwell on the confines of the world and are special favourites of the gods.' Cp. Nitzsch on η 201 sqq. But even this suits the people of Corcyra. The island is not mentioned in the *Catalogue*. It was to Homer outside the Achaean world, like the blameless Aethiopians and the good Abioi. There is no need to press *ἐγγύθεν* to mean that the Phaeacians are near the gods in the sense of inhabiting a non-terrestrial *νῆσος μακάρων*. *ἀντίθεοι*, once applied to them, is too common an epithet to require remark, and *ἀνθρώποισι διοτρεφέεσσι*, ε 378, in Poseidon's mouth, is probably not to be taken of the Phaeacians alone. Rather, the god is contemplating Odysseus' arrival among *ἄνθρωποι* proper, after his experience of such savages as the Cyclopes and Laestrygonες. Confining it to the Phaeacians, Merry and Riddell compare *δῖοι Ἀχαιοί* or *Πελασγοί*. As to the intimate intercourse claimed by Alkinoos, that, even if it be taken seriously, is no strange thing in Greek literature, and especially in Greek epic. In the *Odyssey* itself, ρ 483 sqq., we have it stated that the gods wander about the earth. In *Pylos*, Athené *ἐναργῆς ἦλθε θεοῦ ἐς δαῖτα θάλειαν*, γ 420, 375 sqq., and at *Troy* Diomedes, Z 128, seems to regard a theophany as nothing out of the common. π 161 implies that the gods appear to selected individuals or classes. Taken at its face value, Alkinoos' utterance does not

¹ The only other occurrence of the word in the early epic seems to be *Hymn. Ven.* 200. Its use there gives no support to the fairyists' argu-

ment. With this passage Nitzsch, on ε 35, quotes from Plato, *Πλάτων ἐγγὺς θεῶν γεγονέναι*.

exceed what the ancients believed about their remote ancestors. See a plain statement in Pausanias, VIII. 2, 4, and another in Hesiod, *Fragm.* 82 Rzsch, and some good remarks by Nägelsbach, *op. cit.* 144 sqq.

But the unearthly nature of the Phaeacians is also evidenced by their passenger traffic. They convey home all strangers who come to them. Worse still, they convey them in their (of course the strangers') sleep, though, be it observed, we hear of only *one* case of the kind, that of Odysseus. And, worst of all, they transport their visitors in magic ships.

Their general disposition to help strangers can hardly be considered in itself very strong evidence of the supernatural. The Phaeacians are not the only *φιλόξενοι* people in the poem, and *πομπή* is quite a familiar transaction, as γ 325, ι 518, κ 18, ο 80 sqq. On the other hand, if Scheria be Corcyra, the half-way house between Achæis and the west, the appropriateness of the attribution is evident.

But Odysseus is conveyed in a sleep described as *νήγρετος ἥδιοςτος, θανάτῳ ἄγχιστα ἐοικώς*. The critic on the look out for 'copy' fastens on the mention of death, and at once evolves a theory. I pass the argument that to Homer, Ξ 231, Π 672, as to the English poet, Sleep is Death's twin brother, and that the comparison need not surprise us. Let us rather examine the circumstances. If ever a man earned sound sleep for three, or thrice three, nights in succession, it was Odysseus on this occasion. He had been thrown up on the coast after many days and nights of unceasing physical effort, and had then passed a night on a bed of leaves in the open. He has then two comfortable nights in Alkinoos' palace, but during the third he has to tell a long story, and certainly spends most of it talking hard. Surely then it is not unnatural for him to sleep a sound sleep, a very *χάλκεον ὕπνον*, on his voyage the following night. And there is no divine intervention, no *Zauber*. On the contrary, the sleep is anticipated as a matter of course by all concerned. See η 318 sq. and θ 445. The *πομπήες* make up a bed for Odysseus in the stern-sheets, ν 70 sqq., *ἵνα νήγρετος εὐδοί*. More reasonable than the critics, they felt arrears of sleep were due their passenger, and he was given them. *ἀτρέμας εὐδε*, ν 92—*wie ein kind*, as Preller-Robert put it. And he does not die, but wakes in Ithaka, refreshed and vigorous for the *ἄεθλος ἀάατος* before him. Surely this notion of Phaeacian daemons conveying the hero as mere *κωφή γαῖα*, an *Οὔτις* before his time, is as ill founded as any of the speculations about Scheria. The beauty of the scene ν 70-92 I suppose I must not appeal to. It has always appeared to me to be as perfect and as impressive a piece of description as is to be found in the poems, and I have been astonished to note how seldom that attracts the critic's attention. Groeger, *l.c.*, stresses the appropriateness of the *langentbehrten Schlummer*, and Hahn, *Stimmungen bei Homer*, 5, warmly praises the *unvergleichlichen Zug*, but generally the beauty of the conception, the perfect peace in which the sorely-tried wanderer reaches his native shore, remains unmarked.

The magic ships would be a stronger element in the case, if they could be

taken seriously. The argument is based on the king's words in *θ* 555 sqq. The critics, with justice, find the whole speech lengthy, rambling and contradictory. Well, the occasion is festal, and the culminating point in the festivities has been reached. Alkinoos is in splendid form, for everything conspires to make him indulge his propensity for laudation of his people. This penchant has not long before, as we have seen, led him to a nasty fall, and we feel he must be more careful in future. But he is not. One universal proverb says, 'when the wine is in, the wit is out,' and another that 'there is no fool like an old fool.' All is unexceptionable till the king comes to the promise of a safe passage. The opportunity is irresistible. At the mention of his ships he goes off at a tangent, as the saying is, and utters a prolonged vaunt. Is it necessary or natural to take this as an assertion of matter of fact? How is it even possible? The Phaeacian king and people are described by the poet as ordinary mortal men like Odysseus himself. How are we to reconcile with that the possession of magic ships, self-propelling, endowed with intelligence, and—the earliest known use of naval camouflage—invisible? How are we to reconcile the perfect immunity from sea-risks claimed for the ships, with the distinct danger, which the king in his thoughtlessness actually discloses to his guest, from the displeasure of Poseidon? And how are we to reconcile the bombastic enumeration of wonderful attributes with the subsequent account of the voyage and the preparations for it, which is just what the poet gives us of other trips by merely mortal vessels? See e.g. *ν* 22, 78, 113-5, which show the ship selected was navigated by ordinary methods—as we should expect from more general references, e.g. *θ* 50 sqq., *η* 319 (Alkinoos himself), and *ξ* 268 sqq. Athené praises, *η* 34 sqq., the speed of the ships, and the poet himself their owners' seamanship. The king's extravagant description is mere braggadocio—*πάνν τερατωδέστερον*, Eustath., *καυχᾶται λέγων*, schol.—and quite in keeping with his Homeric character. His pride in his ships overleaps itself so far as to compare them to sentient beings, so well do they answer the demands of their crews.

But such fondly exaggerated descriptions are not uncommon in the mouths of those who own ships and go down to the sea in them, and are imbued with a love for the craft in which they live much of their lives. Take, for instance, the enthusiastic eulogy of the 'Falcon' in *The China Clipper*, p. 21. If she had been a living being, we are told, the sympathy of the appreciative crew could not have been livelier. They recognized how she rebelled at over-pressure, or sulked or was offended at neglect. "She can do everything but speak," was a common remark among the crew.' Had they been proposing her health, after a good dinner, like Alkinoos, they might like him have gone a good deal further. Hennings, *Odyssee*, 258, gives a similar reference to a modern story in which it is said of a steamer, the pet of its owner no doubt, *Man fühlt, dass die Menschen diesem gebrechlichen Dinge eine mutige Seele, einen verständigen Willen verliehen haben . . . es ist ein menschlicher Organismus*, etc. In Jack London's novel, *Adventure*, his heroine speaks of her

favourite schooner as a 'witch,' a 'fairy.' Bérard, I. 488, observes that men of the sea are given to exaggerating to landsmen—beings of an inferior kidney, for 'home-keeping youths have ever homely wits.' Phaeacian ships had, he notes, fifty-two¹ rowers instead of the Achæan twenty. Their speed would be something for the men of the south to speak of and to magnify. It would appear to them, as Ukert says, *Geogr.* 25, *übernatürlich*. Bérard tells us how big British naval craft struck the local nautical mind in the Mediterranean on their first appearance there. A Turkish captain told of one warship that could go from Constantinople to Cairo in a day. It is a good parallel to Alkinoos and his Scheria-Euboea feat, and it was not, apparently, told at a complimentary banquet, when man turns so lightly to flights of fancy in which all his geese are swans.

But we are not done with θ 550 sqq. yet. To my thinking it is genuine, as being in perfect keeping with the character of Alkinoos. But this much has to be observed. It is the mainstay of the fairyland theory, and that theory is accepted by the great majority of the critics who have dissected the episode. Now, if there is one passage in it in regard to the spuriousness of which they are agreed, it is this one. Cut it out then, to please them, and one can cheerfully concede to them all that makes for *Märchen* in the other grounds adduced.

Next, we take the gold and silver κύνες² at the entrance to the palace. If you endow these with life, you are out of the world of sense at once. But even in the abode of the gods such marvels are notably rare—Dr. Leaf on Σ 376. Here there is no reason to suppose they were more than images, ἔργα ζωοῖσιν ὁμοῖα, as Pindar, *Olymp.* VII. 52 sq., expresses it. See Merry and Riddell, *a.l.* The animals show no sign of life. We cannot force φυλάσσεμεναι. The scholiasts' ὥστε δοκεῖν φυλάσσειν is enough. And, as someone has pertinently remarked, if the κύνες were alive, they might at least have given a bark or a growl when Odysseus approached. It is no answer to say the hero was enveloped in mist. If a mortal dog can recognize an immortal god, as in π 162 sq., an immortal hound, ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήραος, and expressly set for watch and ward, could surely expose a stranger sneaking past him. They were only dumb metal. All the life they have is given them by the vividness which Gladstone found in the poet's word-picture of the famous περόνη in τ 226 sqq. In both cases we are presented with a triumph of art, and the language used is in the vein familiar from Martial's 'piscis adspicis, adde aquam natabunt.'

Again some capital has been made out of the reference to Rhadamanthys in η 321 sqq. Alkinoos is speaking, and his remarks read like brag. See

¹ The coincidence with the number of weeks in a year has not been lost on supernaturalists. See Osterwald *op. cit.* 92, and cp. for other *Zahlenspielen* of the kind, *ibid.* 87, and Fick, *Entstehung d. Od.* 190 sqq. To those who believe the poet means no more than what he says, it seems simple to take a crew of fifty, with the ἀρχὸς ναυτῶν and κυβερνητήρ. Vürtheim, *De*

Aiacis origine, 64, divides 52 by 13, the number of the Phaeacian βασιλεῖς, and gets 4, the number of φυλαί—*systema igitur Ionicum*. This is hard to follow.

² I might repeat, in regard to the attitude of the Higher Criticism to the description of Alkinoos' palace and gardens, what I have just said about θ 550 sqq.

what the
ἐνὶ φρεσὶ
The men
he shall
furthest
ὄτε τε ξ
Phaeacia
τῷ αὐτῷ

Con
visit to t
to visit
And the
Scheria.
to Mene
in the m
the view
Psyche,
Rhadam
is by no

The
generally
Ξ 321 so
mother
Elsewhe
of the O
Rhadam
'Ραδάμαν
meant t
ξανθὸς li
And I fi
whether
1888, I.
and Ros
denies h
only bec
l.c. 77.

Crete wa
the auth
puzzle.
Lewy, S
Assman

But
¹ Miss
quaint sug
described i

what they lead up to in the last two lines of the speech—*εἰδήσεις δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ὅσσον ἄρισται | νῆες ἐμαί*—note the emphatic possessive—*καὶ κοῦροι*. The mention of Rhadamanthys comes about thus. The king assures Odysseus he shall be taken home, even if his destination be further away than Euboea, furthest of all lands, at least so said certain Phaeacians who were there *ὅτε τε ξανθὸν Ῥαδάμανθυν | ἦγον ἐποψόμενον Τιτυόν, Γαιήιον υἷόν*. The fast Phaeacian cruisers went there and back on that occasion *ἄτερ καμάτοιο, ἤματι τῷ αὐτῷ*. And that is all.

Commentators have frankly given up the puzzle as to the reason for the visit to the monstrous son of Gaia. Eustathius suggested it was either simply to visit him, or to marvel at his size, *ἢ καὶ ἵνα δίκαιος ὢν σωφρονίσῃ αὐτόν*! And they similarly despair of discovering what Rhadamanthys was doing in Scheria. What they argue from the passage is this. From δ 563 sq. (Proteus to Menelaus) it appears he was on the Elysian Plain. Therefore Scheria was in the neighbourhood of Elysium, and not, or hardly, terrestrial. This was the view of Welcker, against whom are Nitzsch, on η 316 sqq., and Rohde, *Psyche*, 71, 75 and notes, and others. It involves the assumption that Rhadamanthys was on the Plain when the Phaeacians conveyed him, but that is by no means certain.

The first question that arises is, who was this Rhadamanthys? It is generally taken for granted that he was a Cretan, and brother of Minos. In Ξ 321 sq. he and Minos are among the many illegitimate sons of Zeus, their mother being the daughter of Phoinix afterwards known to legend as Europa. Elsewhere in the poems Rhadamanthys is mentioned only in the two passages of the *Odyssey* quoted above, and in each of these he is *ξανθός*. Is he then the Rhadamanthys of the *Iliad*? In Ξ the poet might have said *τε ἰδὲ ξανθὸν Ῥαδάμανθυν*, but we cannot argue solely from the different epithet that he meant to indicate a different person. But surely a Rhadamanthys who is *ξανθός* like Menelaus and other mainland heroes, cannot have been a Minoan?¹ And I find that doubts have been entertained as to his Cretan origin, and whether there were not two of the name.² See Grote, *History*, edition of 1888, I. part i. 210, quoting Ephorus and Aristotle, Friedreich, *Realien*, 519, and Roscher, s.v. *Rhadamanthys*, 78. Bethe, *Minos*, in *Rhein. Mus.* N.F. LXV., denies his connexion with Crete, and says he came to be brother to Minos only because in Boeotia he had been made a son of Europa. Cp. Roscher, *l.c.* 77. Radermacher, *Das Jenseits*, 98, thinks he belongs to Elysium. As Crete was *μακάρων νῆσος*, his transfer thither would easily be made. In fact the authorities are not at all clear about Rhadamanthys. His name remains a puzzle. See Roscher, *l.c.* 85 sq., and add Fick, *Personennamen*,² 432, and Lewy, *Semit. Fremdwörter*, 221 sq. Bérard, I. 69, thinks it Egyptian; cp. Assmann in *Philolog.* LXVII. 173. The *-nth-* ending is significant to some.

But one thing seems certain, that the inference that Scheria is non-

¹ Miss Harrison, *Proleg.* 611, accepts the quaint suggestion of Eustathius that he is so described in δ 564 *πρὸς ἡδονὴν Μεγέλας*!

² In Minos' case a similar doubt has been restated by Professor Ridgeway.

terrestrial is unwarranted. Elysium is on the earth, and mortals sent there retain their mortality. They are by a special dispensation exempted from the common lot—Gladstone, *Synchronism*, 228, and cp. Rohde in *Rhein. Mus.* L, 29 n., who characterizes E. Meyer's view that those housed in Elysium are *Gottheiten* as 'unprovable and not in the least probable.' Cp. also Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *Elysium*, 2470. That is clear also from the passage in δ. Menelaus is not to die, and the beings on the Plain to which he is to be translated are *ἄνθρωποι*, who live a very pleasant life.¹ Only in later times was Elysium made extra-terrestrial—Miss Hutchinson, *Aeacus*, 42. That the Elysian Plain is conceived as near Scheria need not disturb us, even if it be the fact. All that is said of its position in δ 561 sqq. is that it is at the *πείρατα γαίης*. Cp. *ἐπὶ πείρασι γαίης*, *Hym. Ven.* 217, of Tithonos, a mortal still and enjoying the society of a goddess, but somewhere on earth, not in Olympus, and Hesiod, *Opp.* 167 sqq. These indications agree with the tradition that by Scheria was meant Corcyra. There had been voyagings to the West before the first millennium B.C. opens with the foundation of colonies there—cp. Sir W. Ramsay in *C.J.* XIII. 70. Corcyra was just beyond the Achaean world, and beyond it again was the unknown or the little known West, in which the folk located Elysium and other wonderful places. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico* or *pro horrifico*, and the peoples who were rumoured to live beyond an unexplored mountain tract, or across a *μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης*, came to be regarded as no ordinary mortals. Popular imagination was fed by sailors' stories which were inspired by two motives, the glorification of their own exploits and the desire to deter others from following in their tracks. Polybius, IV. 42, 7, quoted by Preller, *Aufsätze*, 463, describes these as *ἡ τῶν πλοῦξομένων ψευδολογία καὶ τερατεία*, and imagination went to one extreme or the other. In the dimly known West there was, as Hepp puts it, *Politisches u. Sociales aus d. Il. u. Od.* 63, 'alles Geheimnisvolle was das Menschenherz anziehen und abschrecken kann.' The unknown peoples were either savage ogres, like the Cyclopes or the Laestrygones, or gentle favourites of the gods, as the Hyperboreans²—Pauly-Wissowa, *l.c.* 2475, or dwellers in *Insulae Fortunatae*, like the inhabitants of the Delectable Land fabled by the people of Western Europe to lie far away in the West—Stjerna, *op. cit.* 104. Cp. the 'island-valley of Avilion,' where Arthur was to heal him of his grievous wound. The Adriatic, in which the Minoans appear to have traded, was later a *mare clausum* to the Achaeans, and, considering what they knew of the general amenity of Corcyra, it may well be that they located Elysium in some island further up the Adriatic coast. Since writing this section I have had access to Malten's excellent paper *Elysion u. Rhadamanthys* in the *Archäol. Jahrb.* 1913, 35 sqq., but as he expressly refrains from inferences from the passage in η, it has not helped me. Good grounds are adduced for believing that Rhadamanthys was in origin a Cretan divinity, but some considerations which tell

¹ So Burnet, *The Socratic Doctrine of the Soul*, 14. 'These really do not die at all.'

² On whom see Miss Macurdy's interesting

paper in *C.R.* XXX. 180 sqq. For the meaning of the name we have either 'above the Bora, or Balkans,' or 'behind the north wind.'

against t
merely a

And
they are
are nearly
But these
little kno
'inchant
the Kenta
Thompson
Gigantes
mytholog
prehistori
were 'rob
'Ungeheu
—θυητοδ
ordinary
φ 303 of
η 57, tho
called div
all other d
of the M
The wild
course.¹
world. S
Philistines
Saxon cor

This
Κῆρες! an
theory. T
became th
'no disput
to withdra
means of t
what it see
human in
incidents
'each one
procedure,
An enquire
case a com
a poet mix

ST. ANDR

against that view seem to be overlooked. To the Greeks he had become merely a *Mann der Vorzeit*.

And, finally, the Phaeacians are sometimes said to be non-human because they are classed with the Cyclopes and Gigantes, as when Alkinoos says they are nearly related to the gods, ὥσπερ Κύκλωπές τε καὶ ἄγρια φύλα Γιγάντων. But these latter are only the wild tribes of the West, inhabiting coasts as little known as once were the 'Bermoothes,' which were supposed to be 'enchanted and inhabited with witches and deuills.' They are on a par with the Kentauroi or Pheres ('hairy beasts') of Thessaly, on whom see Wace and Thompson, *Prehc. Thessaly*, 252, and Fick, *Hattid.* 29. The Kyklopes and Gigantes are not divine or semi-divine beings as they were to later Greek mythology from Hesiod's time, but merely peoples still living in conditions of prehistoric savagery. As Uschold, *Gesch. d. Troj. Kriegeres*, 248, puts it, they were 'rohe Nomaden,' and only later through exaggeration in story made into 'Ungeheuren.' That was understood in antiquity, e.g. by Pausanias, VIII. 29. 2 — θνητοὺς ὄντας καὶ οὐ θεῶν γένος. They were not regarded by Homer as ordinary ἄνδρες or ἄνθρωποι; that is clear from κ 120 of the Gigantes and φ 303 of the Kentauroi. But they were human beings all the same, ζ 5 and η 57, though almost superhuman in their brutal savagery. They may be called divine by descent, but so were the Phaeacians, and many Achaeans and all other ἄνδρες. Farnell, *Cults*, IV. 23 n., observes, à propos of Beloch's view of the Minyans, that very real peoples have fabulous and divine ancestors. The wild ways of such folk beyond the pale were exaggerated as a matter of course.¹ That is how Giants have come into existence in other parts of the world. See 'Giant' in the *Encycl. Brit.* For Palestine see Macalister, *The Philistines*, 60, for Albion and Erin, Mackenzie, *op. cit.* 331, and for the Anglo-Saxon conception, Stjerna, *op. cit.* 38.

This completes the tale of the grounds, and I think we may say θύραζε Κῆρες! and fairly hope that their Anthesteria is done. There is no basis for a theory. The *märchenhaft* idea ran the usual Homeric course. It got a start, became the mode, and rose to the position of an accepted tenet, admitting of 'no dispute.' It was so tempting, as Mulder has remarked, *Phäakendichtung*, 12, to withdraw the improbable and the not readily intelligible from criticism by means of the *märchenhaft* label. The matter in the narrative was anything but what it seemed to be. Prepossession thus prevented an ordinary, everyday, human interpretation, or a proper investigation of the significance of the incidents of the Phaeacian episode. There must be supernaturalness, and 'each one as before did chase His favourite phantom.' It is by similar procedure, as Kroll points out, *l.c.* 180, that 'echte Sage' are often determined. An enquirer accepts a popular theory, and 'saga' is genuine if it fits it. In our case a community of mortals has been elevated to supernatural dignity because a poet mixes some unappreciated chaff in his description of their ways.

A. SHEWAN.

ST. ANDREWS.

¹ Cp. Norlin in *C.P.* XII. 352.

NOTES ON MARTIAL.

I 68.

QVIDQVID agit Rufus, nihil est nisi Naeuia Rufo.
 si gaudet, si flet, si tacet, hanc loquitur.
 cenat, propinat, poscit, negat, innuit: una est
 Naeuia; si non sit Naeuia, mutus erit.
 scriberet hesterna patri cum luce salutem,
 'Naeuia lux,' inquit, 'Naeuia lumen, haue.'
 haec legit et ridet demisso Naeuia uoltu.
 Naeuia non una est: quid, uir inepte, furis?

5

The old interpretations of the last line are fairly represented by Nisard's version, 'Névia n'est pas à toi seul; pourquoi donc, sot amant, une passion si folle?' They suppose that *una* can mean 'uno contenta', and so put themselves out of court. Friedlaender explains thus: 'Der Sinn scheint zu sein: Naeuia liest das Epigramm und lacht, aber Rufus ist thöricht sich zu ereifern, wenn er dies hört. [He is indeed, incredibly so.] Es giebt ja mehr als eine Naeuia, ich kann also auch eine andere meinen. [No, Martial cannot mean any other Naeuia than the one whom Rufus loves.] Zugleich giebt M. wol zu verstehen: Jedes andere Mädchen kann ihm die Stelle des ihn verschmähenden ersetzen.' Zugleich! Mr G. Friedrich may well say in *Rhein. Mus.* 1907 p. 367 'Friedländer hat das Epigramm nicht verstanden'; but he himself proceeds to weave out of nothing a fabric which is not worth the trouble of tearing to pieces: suffice it to say that he forgets to give any interpretation whatsoever of the words *Naeuia non una est*.

All commentators assume that the vocative *uir inepte* is addressed to Rufus. Most of them simply treat *uir* as if it were *homo*; a smaller number see that it ought to mean *marite*, but of these some say that for present purposes it means *adulter*, while others commit the crowning absurdity of supposing that Rufus and Naeuia were man and wife. *uir* means, quite straightforwardly, 'husband'; any husband whose wife's name happens to be Naeuia. The contents of the epigram are the following. Rufus is distraught with love of Naeuia; so distraught that yesterday he began a letter to his father with 'Naeuia darling.' Naeuia peruses this anecdote, so flattering to the vanity of her sex, with a demure smirk of self-complacency. At this point readers who are married to ladies of the name of Naeuia begin to fume and chafe, because it is intolerable that their wives should be represented as taking

pleasur
 one Na
 I
 amat.
 duos',
 distich
 si non
 fuit, c
 95B 'm
 sit Ath
 sed ues

Th
 It is t
 III 86
 iocis ro
 are th
 that am
 many m
 iocari m
 mea | e
 meanin
 those h
 displeas
 ioco
 are just
 mean w
 Quint.
 Λιβυκοί
 The MS
 them at
 III prol.

pleasure in a lover's passion. 'Be calm' says Martial; 'there is more than one Naeuia in the world: why assume that the beloved of Rufus is your wife?'

I subjoin two illustrative parallels. From book III: 8 'Thaida Quintus amat. quam Thaida? Thaida luscum. | unum oculum Thais non habet, ille duos', 11 'si tua nec Thais nec lusca est, Quinte, puella, | cur in te factum distichon esse putas? . . . tu tamen es Quintus. mutemus nomen amantis: | si non uult Quintus, Thaida Sextus amet'. From book IX: 95 'Alphius ante fuit, coepit nunc Olphius esse, | uxorem postquam duxit, Athenagoras', 95B 'nomen Athenagorae credis, Callistrate, uerum. | si scio, dispeream, qui sit Athenagoras. | sed puta me uerum, Callistrate, dicere nomen: | non ego sed uester peccat Athenagoras'.

III 20 1-5.

dic, Musa, quid agat Canius meus Rufus.
utrumne chartis tradit ille uicturis
legenda temporum acta Claudianorum,
an quae Neroni falsus adstruit scriptor
an aemulatur improbi iocos Phaedri?

5

The difficulty of explaining this last verse has been somewhat exaggerated. It is true that both *improbis* and *iocus* have associations (see for instance III 86 4 'non sunt haec mimis *improbiora*' and I 35 13 sq. 'parcas lusibus et *iocis* rogamus | nec castrare uelis meos libellos') which, when the two words are thus brought together, suggest the notion of lascivious poetry; and true that among the extant fables of Phaedrus there is not one lascivious piece, and many moral. But Phaedrus himself describes his fables as *ioci*, I *prol.* 7 'fictis *iocari* nos meminerit fabulis', IV 7 1 sq. 'tu qui, nasute, scripta destringis mea | et hoc *iocorum* legere fastidis genus'; and *improbis*, which is capable of meaning 'disrespectful', as in Hor. *epist.* I 7 63 and elsewhere, may allude to those hits at the high and mighty which are supposed to have provoked the displeasure of Seianus.

iocos however is not the MS text, but *locos* γ, *locus* β; and these lections are just as near to *logos*, which is less misleading and leaves *improbi* freer to mean what it ought. *logi* are fables: Ar. *pac.* 129 ἐν τοῖσιν Αἰσώπου λόγοις, Quint. *inst.* V 11 20 'αἶνον Graeci uocant et Αἰσωπέλους, ut dixi, λόγους et Λιβυκούς', Sen. *dial.* XI 8 3 'fabellas quoque et Aesopeos *logos* (*longos* MSS)'. The MSS of Plautus give *locos* for *logos* at *Men.* 779 and *Stich.* 221 (some of them at 383 and 393), and perhaps the same error occurs in Phaedrus himself, III *prol.* 34-7:

seruitus obnoxia,
quia quae uolebat non audebat dicere,
affectus proprios in fabellas transtulit
calumniamque fictis elusit *locis*.

Editors print *iocis*, which gets support from the *iocari* of the similar verse I *prol.* 7 quoted above; but its *fictis* . . . *fabulis* gives equal support to '*fictis elusit logis*'.

The *locus* of β perhaps points to *logus*, for it is possible that Martial gave the Greek word its Greek inflexion, as he did, if we may trust his MSS, in the genitive *Praxitelus* IV 39 3. Neue's examples of the acc. plur. -*us* for -*ovs* in vol. I p. 209 ed. 3 may be augmented from Lucian Mueller *Lucil.* p. 256; and the palimpsest of Fronto p. 148 Nab. has '*ceratinas et soritas et pseudomenus*'.

V 16 5-8.

nam, si falciferi defendere templa Tonantis
sollicitisque uelim uendere uerba reis,
plurimus Hispanas mittet mihi nauta metretas
et fiet uario sordidus aere sinus.

falciferi templa Tonantis must mean, as Gronovius says, the aerarium in the temple of Saturn. And why should it not? why does Haupt say in *opusc.* III p. 500 '*adparet ineptissimum esse tonantis*', and why do Friedlaender and Duff affix the obelus? Saturn, it is very true, was not the Thunderer, but neither was Propertius Callimachus nor Domitian Nero; yet Juvenal calls Domitian *caluus Nero* and Propertius calls himself *Romanus Callimachus*. The Latin poets, with Hom. *Il.* IX 457 Ζεύς . . . κατὰχθονίως to lend them countenance, will often take the name of Jove in vain and attach to it an epithet explaining what person they really mean: Verg. *Aen.* IV 638 (Ouid. *fast.* V 448, Sil. I 386) *Ioui Stygio* (Diti¹), Sen. *H. f.* 47 *inferni Iouis*, 608 *diro* . . . *Ioui*, H.O. 1705 (Sil. VIII 116, Stat. *Theb.* II 49) *nigri* . . . *Iouis*, Val. Fl. I 730 (Sil. II 674) *Tartareo* . . . *Ioui*, III 384 sq. *tremendi* . . . *Iouis*, Stat. *Theb.* I 615 sq. *profundo* . . . *Ioui*, Auson. 250 8 *Iouis Elysii*; Stat. *Ach.* I 48 sq. *secundi Iouis* (Neptuni), Claud. XVII 282 *Iouis aequorei*, Apoll. Sid. *carm.* 22 158 *tridentiferi Iouis*; Stat. *silv.* III 4 18 *Iuppiter Ausonius* (Domitianus), Mart. XIV 1 2 *nostrum* . . . *Iouem*. *Tonans*, being a synonym, suffers the same usage: Stat. *Theb.* XI 209 *inferno* . . . *Tonanti* (Diti), Mart. IX 39 1 *Palatino* . . . *Tonanti* (Domitiano). In Sen. *Med.* 59 *sceptriferis* . . . *Tonantibus* (*Ioui et Iunoni*) the word signifies only 'sovereign of heaven'; and by *falciferi Tonantis* Martial means no more than what he says in XII 62 1 '*antiqui rex magne poli mundiue prioris*'.

This calls to my mind a misinterpreted passage of Statius, *silv.* I 6 39-42.

i nunc saecula compara, Vetustas,
antiqui Iouis aureumque tempus:
non sic libera uina tunc fluebant
nec tardum seges occupabat annum.

'*antiqui Iouis* das erste, silberne Zeitalter Iuppiters (Ou. *met.* I 113 ff.)' says

¹ So Proserpine is called *Inno Stygia*, *Auerna*, *Actuata*, *inferna*, *infera*, *profunda*.

Mr Vo
accessi
antiqu
georg

In
MSS;
have n
bye for
saying
Munro
use *aet*
mihi .
the ver

'Is tha
dead).'
stands
Rosc. 20

For
Friedlae
corrupt.
them';
uirum m
en roga
uir es, c
proof of
indulgin
contemp
non scrib
not pur
disertos
of not w

Mr Vollmer. It was not in the silver age that wine flowed all abroad: Jove's accession put a stop to that, 'et passim riuus currentia uina repressit' *antiquus Iuppiter*, like *falcifer Tonans*, is Saturn, 'aureus . . . Saturnus' Verg. *georg.* II 538. So already F. Morellus.

V 66.

saepe salutatus numquam prior ipse salutas.
sic eris aeternum, Pontiliane, uale.

In the days before Schneidewin editors used to read *erit* with inferior MSS; the present text is expounded thus: 'The poet says that . . . he will have no more to do with him: he shall be to the poet *aeternum uale*, a good-bye for ever' (Paley and Stone, 1868). Such words have no meaning. By saying good-bye to a person you do not transform him into a good-bye. Munro punctuated 'sic eris aeternum, Pontiliane? uale'; but nobody would use *aeternum* here instead of *semper*, and Verg. *Aen.* XI 97 sq. 'salue aeternum mihi . . . aeternumque uale' discountenances or even forbids this divorce of the verb and adverb. I should write therefore

sic eris? aeternum, Pontiliane, uale.

'Is that how you mean to behave? then farewell for ever (you are to me as dead).' IX 7 4 'non uis, Afer, hauere: uale'. *sic*, as in Munro's punctuation, stands for *talis*: Ter. *Phorm.* 527 'sic sum; si placeo, utere', Cic. *pro Q. Rosc.* 29 'sic est uulgus', Tib. I 10 43 'sic ego sim', Hom. *Il.* XI 762 ὡς ἐόν.

VI 14.

uersus scribere posse te disertos
adfirmas, Laberi: quid ergo non uis?
uersus scribere qui potest disertos,
non scribat, Laberi: uirum putabo.

For *non scribat* Schneidewin in his second edition wrote *conscribat*; Friedlaender Gilbert and Lindsay follow him, and Duff marks *non scribat* as corrupt. *conscribat* I suppose will mean something like 'make a book of them'; but nothing of this sort will accord with *uirum putabo*. The force of *uirum* may be seen from II 69 'inuitum cenare foris te, Classice, dicis: . . . en rogat ad cenam Melior te, Classice, rectam. | grandia uerba ubi sunt? si uir es, ecce nega.' If a person can write accomplished verse, he gives no proof of stoutness or manfulness by indulging his faculty: to refrain from indulging it, *non scribere*, may at any rate be held to argue strength of will and contempt of fame. But I imagine that Schneidewin's difficulty was this: *non scribat* evidently must suggest the pursuit of a course which Laberius did not pursue, and yet 'quid ergo non uis?' implies that 'non scribere uersus disertos' was the course which he did pursue. Yes, but there are two ways of not writing accomplished verse. One is to write nothing, *non scribere*; and

if the epigram ended with line 2 we should perhaps infer that this was what Laberius did. Line 4 lets us know that it was not: *scribebat ille quidem uersus, sed non disertos*.

The phrase *uirum putabo* recurs in a passage of Cicero, *ad Q. frat.* II 9 (= 10 = 11) 3, which does not reflect much credit on its critics, whether radical or conservative.

Lucreti poemata, ut scribis, ita sunt, multis luminibus ingenii, multae tamen artis. sed, cum ueneris. uirum te putabo, si Sallusti Empedoclea legeris, hominem non putabo.

After suffering various changes in the past from Ernesti, Orelli, Lachmann, Bergk, Munro, and others, it is now printed as above by Messrs Tyrrell and Purser and the last editor Mr Sjoegren; and they are quite satisfied with it and with themselves. 'Lucretius' books of poetry, as you say in your letter, have many scintillations of genius, yet much art as well': *tamen* is explained, after Munro in the introduction to his commentary on Lucretius, as implying that there is almost an incongruity between genius (like that of Ennius) and art (like that of Catullus and Calvus), and that Lucretius combined two virtues which might be thought irreconcilable. 'But more on that matter when you are here': *cum ueneris* has this sense in *ad Att.* II 3 1 'quid sit sciemus, cum ueneris' and elsewhere, and the principal verb is similarly omitted *ibid.* XII 21 2 'sed coram', 'but more of this when we meet'.

Very well: and now what of the last sentence? 'I shall think you a stout-hearted man if you get through Sallust's Empedoclea, I shall not think you a human being.' That the same person under the same conditions should be *uir* and should not be *homo* is a contradiction in terms. If one is not a human being, one cannot be a stout-hearted man nor a man of any sort; one is either above or below humanity, a god or a beast; and *uir* is not Latin for a stout-hearted god nor for a stout-hearted beast. Applied to any creature not human, it means either a male or a husband; and here it can mean neither. Yet Vahlen *opusc.* I p. 154, far from perceiving the discrepancy, maintains in opposition to Bergk that *uirum te putabo* and *hominem non putabo* are inseparably associated; and to defend this sentence, where the same person is *uir* and yet not *homo*, he quotes, if you will believe me, sentences where the same person is both *homo* and *uir*: Cic. *ad fam.* V 17 3 'ut et *hominem* te et *uirum* esse meminisses, id est, communem incertumque casum . . . sapienter ferres et dolori fortiter ac fortunae resisteres', 'in other words, that you should bear philosophically the changes and chances which are our common portion (as *homo*), and show a bold face to pain and misfortune (as *uir*)'; *Tusc.* II 53 'Marius et tulit dolorem, ut *uir*, et, ut *homo*, maiorem ferre sine causa necessaria

¹ 'Diese Ansicht hat zuerst F. Marx (*Berl. phil. Woch.* 1891 Sp. 834) vorgebracht' says Schanz *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.* I ii p. 43 ed. 3. It was put forward by Tyrrell in 1886. There is another false attribution in the next epistle,

II 10 1, where the emendation *pipulo* for *populi*, ascribed by Mr Sjoegren in his edition to Housmanus and in his *commentationes Tullianas* p. 158 to Housmannus, is due to neither of those critics, but again to Tyrrell.

noluit'
non fer
feel and
strange
conclud
of the w
to it nei
taste, p
defence
elegant
ordinary
attempt
So
Sjoegren
are out
involve
and Mun
does not
<si . .
read thro
Empedo

ames
by Schne
Lindsay's
collations
latter far
much the
much bet
individual
must mea
mood, as
31 sq. 'sit
uelle ten
simulacra
agas, ager
In th
following
quidqu
ingly alter

noluit'; Sen. *dial.* XI 17 2 'nam et non sentire mala sua non est hominis, et non ferre non est uiri',—you are both *homo* and *uir*, and you therefore both feel and endure. The effect of these passages is to enhance by contrast the strangeness of what we find in the letter to Quintus. And when Vahlen has concluded his very untoward citations and comes to the definite explanation of the words before us, he is obliged to invent for *homo* a sense which belongs to it neither in the citations nor anywhere else: he says it means a man of taste, possessing 'pulchri sensum et decori'. Another and very different defence of the text is essayed by Tyrrell and Purser, who rely chiefly upon elegant mistranslation. *hominem esse* they interpret 'to be subject to the ordinary weaknesses of humanity': correct 'ordinary' to 'universal' and the attempt collapses.

So long as these words are left in their present condition, to say with Mr Sjoegren that the passage is 'locus iniuria temptatus' is to holloa before you are out of the wood. The correction of this sentence may, for aught we know, involve some change in the preceding sentences, like the conjectures of Bergk and Munro. I think it probable however that the true correction is one which does not. A second protasis may have fallen out thus: 'uirum te putabo, <si . . .>; si Sallusti Empedoclea legeris, hominem non putabo', 'if you can read through . . ., you are a man indeed; if you can read through Sallust's Empedoclea, you are more or less than human'.

VI 29 7 sq.

inmodicis brevis est aetas et rara senectus.

quidquid ames, cupias non placuisse nimis.

ames is read by Scriuerius and some other of the older editors, but *amas* by Schneidewin and all the moderns except Mr Duff. According to Mr Lindsay's apparatus criticus *ames* is the reading of β and *amas* of γ ; but his collations in *Ancient editions of Martial* p. 82 show that E, the best MS of the latter family, gives *ames* in agreement with the former. *ames* therefore has much the better authority to uphold it; and it is also upheld by something much better than any authority, the sense. This poem is addressed to no individual, and there is nobody for the 2nd pers. indic. to refer to. The words must mean 'whatever one loves', and the subjunctive is then the proper mood, as in Ouid. *art.* I 741 'non tutum est, quod ames, laudare sodali', *her.* XX 31 sq. 'sit fraus huic facto nomen dicarque dolosus, | si tamen est, quod ames, uelle tenere dolus', Lucr. IV 1061 sq. 'nam, si abest quod ames, praesto simulacra tamen sunt | illius', Cic. *de sen.* 27 'quod est, eo decet uti et, quidquid agas, agere pro uiribus'.

In this passage of Cicero Dr Reid prints *agis* for *agas* and has the following note:

quidquid agis: all MSS and editions hitherto have *agas*, which I have unhesitatingly altered because (1) the subjunctive does not occur in Cicero after *quisquis*,

quicumque, ubi and the like unless in *oratio obliqua* or by the attraction of the indicative into the mood of a neighbouring subjunctive, (2) *agas* would be doubly peculiar after *quod est*. See a valuable note by Kühner on *Tusc.* I 110, whose conclusions are entirely confirmed by my own reading. Thus in *de or.* III 201 the clause *quibuscumque uerbis uti uelis* is parallel with and influenced by the preceding conditional clause *si uerba mutaris*.

Cicero employs the subjunctive where the sense requires that mood, *quisquis* or no *quisquis*; and the sense requires it here. Cato's meaning is not 'quidquid tu, Scipio, agis' but 'quidquid agimus', 'whatever one does'. This construction, whose occurrence in Cicero Dr Reid denies, recurs at *de off.* III 57 'neque enim id est celare, *quidquid reticeas*, sed cum, quod tu scias, id ignorare emolumenti tui causa uelis eos quorum intersit id scire', and also, though the eye alone cannot there detect it, at *de amic.* 22 'amicitia res plurimas continet; *quoquo te uerteris*, praesto est'. Even in the passage cited by Dr Reid, *de or.* III 200 'inter conformationem uerborum et sententiarum hoc interest, quod uerborum tollitur, si uerba mutaris, sententiarum permanet, *quibuscumque uerbis uti uelis*', the mood is due to no external influence but to inherent propriety, and *uelis* would remain *uelis* if there were nothing but indicatives in the neighbourhood. As for *agas* after *quod est*, far from being doubly peculiar, it is both logical and regular, like Lucr. II 850 'quoad licet ac possis reperire' or Ouid. *amor.* III 14 7 sq. 'quis furor est, quae nocte latent, in luce fateri | et, quae clam facias, facta referre palam?'

VIII 56 17-20.

excidit attonito pinguis Galatea poetae
Thestylis et rubras messibus usta genas:
protinus Italiam concepit et ARMA VIRVMQVE
qui modo uix culicem fleuerat ore rudi.

Schneidewin and all his successors print *ITALIAM* or indicate by other means that they regard this word, like *ARMA VIRVMQVE*, as a quotation. But whence is it quoted? not surely from *Aen.* I 2. *Italiam* in that line is not an object of *cano* but merely one of a dozen words in a relative clause; it signifies no conception or design of Virgil's; and in any case it would be perverse to cite the opening of the second line before the famous and symbolic opening of the whole epic.

Schrevel and other of the earlier editors give the verse as I do. *Italiam* means the theme of Italy. Whether this also refers to the *Aeneid*, especially book VII and verses 641-4 'pandite nunc Helicon, deae, cantusque mouete, | qui bello exciti reges, quae quemque secutae | complerint campos acies, quibus Italia iam tum | floruerit terra alma uiris, quibus arserit armis', or whether to the *georgics* and especially to the laudes Italiae in II 136-76, it is possible to doubt.

IX 20 5 sq.

hic steterat ueneranda domus quae praestitit orbi
quod Rhodos astrifero quod pia Creta polo.

The birthplace of Domitian is equalled to Crete, the birthplace of Jove, and to Rhodes, the birthplace of whom? Of Neptune, say the commentators; for Posidon, though not indeed born in Rhodes, was reared there by the Telchines, Diod. Sic. V 55 1. Neptune however has no particular connexion with *astrifer polus*, and the god meant is Sol, who according to one story was born in his own chosen island. Cic. *n. d.* III 54 'Soles ipsi quam multi a theologis proferuntur! unus eorum Ioue natus, nepos Aetheris, alter Hyperione, tertius Vulcano, Nili filio, cuius urbem Aegyptii uolunt esse eam quae Helio-polis appellatur, quartus is quem heroicis temporibus Acantho Rhodi peperisse dicitur', Ampel. 9 3, Arnob. *nat.* IV 14, schol. Bern. ad Luc. VIII 248.

Tiberius is likened to the Sun by Manilius IV 765 sq. and by Antiphilus *anth. Pal.* IX 178; and the shepherd in buc. Einsidl. I 27 is uncertain, as Martial seems to be, whether his emperor more resembles the supreme deity or the chief light in the firmament: 'seu caeli mens illa fuit seu Solis imago'.

IX 99.

Marcus amat nostras Antonius, Attice, musas,
charta salutatrix si modo uera refert,

Marcus, Palladiae non infitianda Tolosae
gloria, quem genuit pacis alumna quies.

tu, qui longa potes dispendia ferre uiarum,
i, liber, absentis pignus amicitiae.

5

uilis eras, fateor, si te nunc mitteret emptor;
grande tui pretium muneris auctor erit.

multum, crede mihi, refert a fonte bibatur
quae fluit an pigro quae stupet unda lacu.

10

4. The singularly unintelligent conjecture *quam* for *quem*, proposed long ago by Scriuerius, has been repeated by Friedlaender and adopted by Gilbert. 'Das überlieferte *quem* ist unhaltbar' says Friedlaender, 'denn der Friede konnte nur den Ruhm des Antonius . . . erzeugen, aber nicht ihn selbst'. *gloria* does not mean 'der Ruhm des Antonius', and would make nonsense if it did: it means Antonius himself, who was the glory of Toulouse. The conjecture therefore does not alter the sense, it only corrupts the Latin. *quam* is not grammatical: no more grammatical than *quae* would be in IV 55 1-3 'Luci, *gloria* temporum tuorum, | *qui* Caium ueterem Tagumque nostrum | Arpis cedere non sinis disertis'; no more grammatical than the *deuoraturam* which Geppert fancied he had found in the palimpsest at Plaut. *rud.* 543 sq. 'iam postulabas te, impurata *belua*, | totam Siciliam *deuoraturum* insulam'. 'Wer von Grammatik und Sprachgebrauch nur eine mäsige Kenntniss hat,

arcum | ascendens, seros demum complectitur annos | labentemque diem uitae tremulamque senectam'. In Paul. Alex. fol. D 3 ed. 1586 the first arc corresponds to τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν, λέγω δὲ τὴν νεότητα, the second to τὴν μετὰ τὴν νεότητα ἡλικίαν, ἥτις ἐστὶ μέση, the third to τὴν τοῦ γήρως ἡλικίαν, and the fourth to τὴν πρεσβυτικὴν ἡλικίαν ἕως τῆς τοῦ θανάτου τελευτῆς; and this appears to be the distribution which Martial has in view. There are other passages of Latin poetry which possibly or probably refer to this astrological scheme of κέντρα and τεταρτημόρια: Luc. VII 380 sq. 'ultima fata | deprecor ac turpes extremi cardinis annos', Sen. Tro. 52 'mortalis aevi cardinem extremum premens'.

XII 59.

tantum dat tibi Roma basiorum
post annos modo quindecim reuerso
quantum Lesbia non dedit Catullo.
te uicinia tota, te pilosus
hircoso premit osculo colonus, 5
hinc instat tibi textor, inde fullo,
hinc sutor modo pelle basiata,
hinc menti dominus periculosi,
hinc {dextiochulus et β} inde lippus
 {dextioculus γ}
fellatorque recensque cunnilingus. 10
iam tanti tibi non fuit redire.

Although some MSS of the family γ offer *desiocolus* and *desioculus*, whence the impossible word *defioculus* was coined and issued in the old editions, it is plain from a comparison of the two stocks that *dextioc(h)olus* was in the archetype. But *dextiocholus* (if ever there was such a word) is no better sense than metre. Neither leg, so far as I have noticed, is much used in kissing; and it therefore does not appear how lameness can lend horror to a kiss, nor what difference it makes if the lame leg happens to be the right one. The conjectural substitutes for the letters between *hinc* and *inde* are either violent or absurd: *defioculusque et, caecis oculis et* (with *lippis*), *luscusque oculis et, factus modo luscus, de fornice luscus, et dextiocholus, rex unoculus uel*.¹ If anyone proposed *hinc cui dest oculus, set inde lippus*, I should think it less open to objection, but no truer than the rest; for they all leave the poem labouring under a defect which they do not even aim at repairing.

¹ This last conjecture is Mr Birt's, and very like him. In the same place, *Rhein. Mus.* 1916 pp. 274-6, he corrupts the *menti* of u. 8 into *uenti*, of all things in the world, because *menti periculosi* 'ist offenbar Unsinn'. I therefore cite Plin. n. h. XXVI 2 'grauissimum ex his (nouis faciei morbis) lichenas appellauere Graeco nomine, Latine, quoniam a *mento* fere oriebatur, . . .

mentagram,' 3 'non fuerat haec lues apud maiores patresque nostros, et primum Ti. Claudii Caesaris principatu medio inrepsit in Italiam quodam Perusino equite Romano quaestorio scriba, cum in Asia adparuisset, inde *contagionem* eius importante. nec sensere id malum feminae aut seruitia plebesque humilis aut media, sed proceros *uoloci transitu oculi maxime*'.

There are in Martial many epigrams addressed to persons whom he does not call by name. Some of these, II 85 and IV 19 and many in books XIII and XIV, are *xenia* or *apophoreta*: the person is merely the recipient of a gift, and his name and address were on the parcel. In one poem, V 60, the name is designedly withheld. There remains a large class, comprising I 66, II 39, 61, 76, III 23, 49, IV 41, 47, 76, 88, VI 64, VII 25, 75, VIII 14, 34, 47, 74, X 45, 59, 100, XI 22, 44, XII 26, 37, 47, 48, 50, 86, in which the persons addressed are chosen as types or invented for the occasion. From that class this epigram is excluded, if by nothing else, by the touch of personal detail in u. 2, 'post annos modo quindecim reuerso': it is addressed at a particular time to a living and breathing acquaintance of Martial's, and in view of Martial's practice we expect to have his name. And we have it: *Dexi*. The gens *Dexia* survives in several inscriptions collected by W. Schulze *Gesch. lat. Eigennamen* p. 272: C. I. L. VI 16824 L. *Dexio Ilo*, VIII 2858-60 Q. *Dexius Licinianus*, IX 6078 73 C. *Dexi Staberiani*, X 411 C. *Dexsius*, 534 *Dexio Decumino*, XI 949 *Dexsia*, 4206 sq. C. *Dexius*: add Cic. *ad fam.* VII 23 4 'est enim profectus in Hispaniam *Dexius*.' The name of the person addressed is most commonly put near the beginning of an epigram, but it may be deferred till the last line, as at III 82 33, or the last but one, as at VIII 61 8, or the last but two, as here and at X 73 8, or may stand in the middle, as at VIII 38 8.

Before proceeding further we must ask whether *et* has been wrongly added in β or wrongly subtracted in γ . The parallel of u. 6 is against the conjunction, and no motive for its omission is apparent, whereas it may have been inserted by some one who was at least metrist enough to know that the line ought to have eleven syllables. It seems therefore that criticism has now to deal only with the letters *oc(h)olus*.

De Rooy and Munro and Gilbert have all wished to introduce the word *luscus*, and naturally. Martial couples it with *lippus* in VI 78 1 sq. 'lumine uno | *luscus* Phryx erat alteroque *lippus*', VIII 9 1 sq. 'soluere dodrantem nuper tibi, Quinte, uolebat | *lippus* Hylas, *luscus* uult dare dimidium', 59 1-6 'cuius | *lippa* sub adtrita fronte lacuna patet . . . oculo *luscus* utroque uidet', and its appropriateness to this epigram is well shown by II 33 3 'cur non *basio* te, Philaeni? *lusca* es.' *lus* then is probably the surviving half of *lus-cus*, and it only remains to find a pyrrhic which will complete the verse. The sense does not require, and hardly even admits, any addition, so I should expect here the cognomen of *Dexius*, for Martial often calls his friends by two of their names: I 107 *Luci* . . . *Iuli*, IV 71 *Safroni Rufe*, VI 85 *Rufe Camoni*, VII 41 *Semproni Tucce*, 47 *Licini* . . . *Sura*, 68 *Instanti Rufe*, X 33 *Mumati Galle*, 44 *Quinte* . . . *Ouidi*, XI 52 *Iuli Cerialis*, XII 4 *Prisce Terenti*. The nearest to the letters will be the rare cognomen *Colo*: C. I. L. VI 32764 L. *Cassio Coloni*, VIII 15472 Q. *Numisius C. f. Arn. Colo Heluacianus*, X 3395 *Camurius Colo*, *Antonius Colo*.

hinc, *Dexi Colo*, *luscus*, inde *lippus*.

A slip from *ol* to *ol* and from *us* to *us* reduces *dexicololuscus* to *dexicolus*, which is, as it happens, the original reading of E. The additional *o* in *dexicolus* may be that *o* which is often written over a vocative to indicate the case, and which to most readers would be a welcome signpost when the vocative was so unfamiliar as *dexi colo*.

Although this conjecture accounts for every letter in the corrupt text of the MSS, it is not for that reason true, and the truth may be something which is further away from the letters and will not account for them. *Dexi* is the MS reading and *luscus* a probable change, but *Colo*, having nothing better than palaeography to rest on, is quite uncertain, and indeed there is no actual proof that its first syllable is short.

XII 95 1-4.

Musseti pathicissimos libellos,
qui certant Sybariticis libellis,
et tinctas sale pruriente chartas,
Instanti, lege, Rufe.

Musseti codd., *Musaei* edd. And who is this Musaeus? 'Ein sonst unbekannter Autor' says Friedlaender. But, if you know nothing else about him, how do you know his name? who told you it was Musaeus and not, as the MSS say, Mussetius? The latter exists in *C. I. L.* XIV 2982 *Musseti*, and with variations of spelling in XI 5702 and 5718 *L. Musetio*, VIII 6236 *Musetia*, ib. suppl. 19168 *Musaetiae*. Martial's Mussetius has as much right to his place in the text, and to a mention in lexicons and histories of literature, as Ovid's Turranius or half-a-dozen other poets out of *ex Pont.* IV 16. But instead of him we find in De Vit's *onomasticon* 'Musaeus, poeta, auctor carminum nefandi argumenti, teste Martial. 12, 95', and in Teuffel's *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* § 329 4 'Mart. 12, 95 *Musaei pathicissimos libellos* (griechisch?)'.

The reading of L is *Musetis*, but this is rather *Musseti* with an *s* out of place than a token of the spelling *Museti*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

PHAEDRIANA.

III.

NOVAE FABVLAE (*continued*).

To my restorations of Nouae Fabulae of Phaedrus (*Classical Quarterly* XII. [1918], pp. 151 sqq.), I would now add the following :

VIII. THE SICK KITE.

(Thiele No. XXIII.)

For this Fable both Ademar and the Weissenburg MS. (*Wissemburgensis*) fail us. We have, however, the representatives of R, which Thiele groups under his *Recensio Gallicana*, and one (the Codex Vindobonensis lat. 303) which he places in his *Recensio Vetus*; of the other two one does not contain it, and the third, the Erfordtensis at Berlin, has a wholly independent version, which Thiele most strangely regards as imported from 'Phaedrus in prose,' although neither in diction nor in remnants of metre has it anything to suggest such an origin. His 'restoration' (*Einleitung*, p. ccxxi) may accordingly be neglected.

Multos iaceret menses cum aeger miluus
nec spem uideret esse iam uitae, rogat
cum lacrimis matrem ut sancta circum iret loca
et pro salute magna <dis> promitteret.
'Faciám,' inquit 'fili, quod uis; ut uero impetrem,
uehementer timeo, quando delubra omnia
uastasti et cuncta polluisti altaria
nec sacris temperasti; nunc quid uis precer?'

1 *Multos . . . menses* Gude, *iaceret . . .* : *aeger* is my correction, *aegrotasset* Gude. R gives *miluus cum aegrotaret* (*aegrotare coepisset*) *et multis mensibus iaceret* (but one MS. has *infirmus iaceret nec amplius spem uitae iam esse uideret*).

2 *nec—uitae* my correction, *nec spem uitae suae uideret iam esse* (*iam haberet*) R, *nec iam uideret esse uitae spem suae* Gude. But *suae* (*sibi* Mueller) can be dispensed with and its room is needed for the verse.

2, 3 *rogat—matrem* my correction, *matrem* (*suam*) *cum lacrimis* (one MS. *lacrimando*) *rogabat* R.

ut—loca I have given from R's *ut sancta loca circuiret* (*uisitaret*), *matrem rogabat sancta* (or perhaps *sacra*) *circum iret loca* Gude Mueller, sacrificing *cum lacrimis* and the Phaedrian *ut*.

4 My correction for 'pro salute illius' or 'sua,' (two variants which cut each

other's throats) *magna uota (u. m.) promitteret* R, *et pro s. uota faceret maxima* Gude (*filii* Mueller). *promittere uota* appears not to be classical. 'dis' was readily omitted, and 'salute' in Phaedrus need have no qualifier.

5 I give *faciam*—*uis* with the MSS. Gude omits *quod uis*, Mueller *filii* as well.

ut uero impetrem I have given from R's redundant *uerum timeo ne non impetrem, illud enim uereor, nate, et uehementer timeo* (with minor variants), *sed opem ne non impetrem* | *uehementer uereor* Gude. But *ne non* is merely a substitute for the less obvious *ut*. Compare Ademar's *ut non* for *quin* Fab. III. 4 (*Cl. Quarterly*, l. c., p. 156).

6 *timeo* seems slightly more probable than *uereor*. For the doublet compare *noli timere . . . noli uereri* in P at I. 25. 7.

8 *sacris temperasti* is my correction, *pepercisti sacrificiis* R, *sacrificiis nullis parcens* Gude; but Phaedrus does not use *sacrificium*, and *pepercisti* is an unlikely substitute for *parcens*. For *temperasti* cf. '*temperauit, pepercit abstinuit*' *Corp. Gl.* IV. 424. 42 and Livy 1. 29. 6 '*templis deum temperatum est*.'

precer is my correction for *ut orem*, Gude *rogem*.

The 'morals' prefixed or appended to this piece have no claim to antiquity.

IX. THE TRAVELLER AND THE SWORD.

(Thiele No. XCIV.)

Gladium uiator<forte> uico ut uiderat
iacentem interrogauit 'Quis te perdidit?'
cui telum 'Me quidem unus sed multos ego.'

The Fable is not in Ademar nor in the Weissenburg MS.

1, 2 *forte*—*iacentem* is my restoration, *dum ambulabat* (-aret, -at) *iacentem inuenit in uia*. *forte uiderat* is the equivalent in sense of *inuenit*. *in* was an obvious insertion for scribes who stumbled over the Phaedrian use of the simple ablative. *uia* which can hardly stand by *uiator* was an equally easy corruption of *uico*.¹

quem interrogauit the paraphrasts. Mueller reads for the two lines *Gl. u. media proiectum uia* | *inuenit et rogauit*.

3 *cui contra telum* (gladius one MS.) the paraphrasts, except that one MS. has corrupted further to *cui tale contra responsum dedit*. The *contra* which I have omitted is a false Phaedrian reminiscence, as probably also in *App. Perottina* 30. 10.

sed multos ego my correction, *ego uero multos* the paraphrasts, *at plures ego* Mueller. But *sed* follows *quidem* in II. 8. 17, IV. 13. 2. His *plures* is obviously needless.

I would add that I dissent from Havet's condemnation of Mueller's verse on the ground of the elision in caesura.

PHAEDRVS IV. xiv.

THE APE AT THE LION'S COURT.

(Thiele No. LXX.)

Amongst the pieces included in the collections of the paraphrasts the position of IV. xiv. is singular. It is the only instance in which their versions can be called in to supply a considerable gap in the extant manuscripts, or

¹ *Gladium ambulans uiator ut uico inuenit* would be nearer to the letter of the paraphrasts' version, but Thiele appears to be right in saying

that '*dum ambularet*, etc.' is a 'superfluous addition of Romulus.'

rather m
clearly i
portion

The
aimed at
of his p
escaping
The
which M

are repr
ing the
must be
have to

prod
paeniten

I h
us with
may co
Th
P as in

Th
4 A
sibi fera
5
agrees
6
factis et
7
carnivo
preserv
8
by thei

1 Wh
that in
corresp
drus?

rather manuscript, of Phaedrus. For the purposes of any restoration it is clearly incumbent on us to compare the manuscript and the paraphrasts in the portion that they have in common.

The subject of the Fable, which is generally, with justice, supposed to be aimed at Caligula and his speedy relapse from the fair promise of the beginning of his principate, is the impossibility of even the most dexterous of flatterers escaping destruction in the court of a tyrant.

The three lines prefixed in the *Pithoeanus* and the lost *Remensis*, and which M. Havet does ill to separate from what follows

‘Vtilius homini nihil est quam recte loqui’
probanda cunctis est quidem sententia
sed ad perniciem solet agi sinceritas

are represented in the Weissenburg version alone, and here in a form displaying the corruption we have so often to deplore in this manuscript, but which must be here reproduced, as in more than one passage of the sequel we shall have to build upon what it offers.

proda (representing *probanda*) autem est cunctis qui de hanc re sententiam sed sine paenitentia solet agi sinceritas.

I have italicized the traceable remains of our mangled poet, preserved for us with ignorant honesty, to which we should perhaps add that *sine paenitentia* may come from a *pernitentia*, a corruption through *sententia* of *ad perniciem*.¹

The Fable itself opens with the lines given with very slight corruption in P as in R.²

cum se ferarum regem fecisset leo	
et aequitatis uellet famam consequi,	5
a pristina deflexit consuetudine	
atque inter illas, tenui contentus cibo,	
sancta incorrupta iura reddebat fide.	
postquam labare coepit paenitentia—	9

The noteworthy deviations in the paraphrasts are as follows :

4 Ad. and most of R but not Wiss. make the beasts elect the lion king ‘*cum sibi ferae regem fecissent*,’ and they all add the ornamental epithet *fortissimus*.

5 They add the amplification *more regum* (*regio*). With this exception Wiss. agrees verbally with Phaedrus, the rest have *bonam famam*.

6 They change the to them unusual expression, giving *renuntiauit prioribus factis et mutauit consuetudinem* or the like.

7 They develop the sense here, making the Lion refrain from gratifying his carnivorous appetites, *pecus ullum se non laedere, sine sanguine cibum sumere*. Wiss. alone preserves *contentus* (*sine sanguine cibum*).

8 They agree in misreading, or misunderstanding, *iura reddebat* as is evidenced by their versions ‘*sanctam et interruptam iurauit se fidem seruare*.’

¹ What are we to say of Herr Thiele's theory that in this and many other instances such correspondences prove interpolation from Phaedrus? What does he suppose interpolators are

after? Nonsense?

² *rege* (l. 1) P, and *lanare* (l. 6) PR (Havet in No. 91, where also the bulk of the material from the paraphrasts is given).

11 *coepit aliquos ducere in secretum* (-o) Ad R, Wiss. having *singulos*. I write *occepit*, corrupted to *coepit* as at III. 16. 7 (but preserved there by NV) and, with Mueller, *aliquot*, which Phaedrus uses more than once.

12 The paraphrasts *et fallacia* (*ut falleret* one MS.) *quaerere* (*ab eis*) *si(an) ei os puteret* or *feteret* (*an os foetens haberet* Ad.). To decide between *puteret* or *feteret* is far from easy.

13 My restoration is based on Wiss. *uerum mendacium dicente* (for -es). The readings of the rest are obviously attempts to make things plainer, e.g. *illos qui dicebant putet et qui dicebant non putet* R (the *Vetus* more artistically *tam eas quas negabant quam quas confitebantur*).

14 *omnes (tamen) laniabat ita ut saturaretur sanguine* (*et saturabatur eorum carnibus* Ad.). Ad. R Wiss. is defective.

15 *haec*, or *hoc*, *cum multis fecisset* (*faceret*) Ad. R Wiss. *uenit ad simium* is given by *Vetus*, which adds *interrogans* (below), *postea simium interrogabat* R. *uenit ad s.* is wrongly understood by Thiele in a literal sense: he accepts the *uocat simiam ad se, interrogat* of Ad. for his reconstruction of the prose of the *Recensio Gallicana*.

16 *idem* is *rogatus* again is based on the *Vetus* '*interrogans eam simili modo.*' The rest have tasteless expansions as Ad. *si putidum haberet os*, Wiss. *si foetium haberet os*. *cinnamomo suauis* is from Ad., (*quasi*) *cinnamomum* (*cinnamum*) the rest.

17 The paraphrasts are divided between *fragrare* and *olere*. Compare v. 12 and note on VIII. 6 above.

et decorum altariibus Mueller, *et quasi d. altaria* the paraphrasts.

18 *leo autem (uero Ad.) laudatorem erubuit laedere* or *ut laederet* Ad. R. My *hunc* (indispensable) has some support in Wiss. *tunc erit* (all that is left of *erubuit*).

19 *fidem ut mutaret* which I have written is variously corrupted and amplified (by doublets) in the paraphrasts; *ut deciperet, mutauit fidem et quaesiuit fraudem, fidem irrumpeus* (the *Vetus*), *auc<n>s fraude<m>* Wiss., *cum sederet* (? l.) *mutauit fidem* Ad. *finxit sese languidum* I have based on Wiss. *esse finxit languidum*; *languere se*, or *languorem simulabat* R more obvious expressions, but cf. Seneca *Benef.* 4. 17. 3 '*bonos se ac liberales fingunt.*'

20 *concurrunt* my conjecture, *continuo querunt* Wiss., *cont. uenerunt* R. The correction of the rest of the line is based on Wiss. '*medici [potius clini] uberi* (from *ubi erant*) *passim ullique* (from *undique*) *genus.*' Thiele has seen that in the bracketed words *clinici* is concealed; *potius* means 'say rather,' the words being a reader's comment on *medici*. Thiele also suggests *ubi erat* (*passio*). But *passim undique* forms a substitute, or substitutes, for the rare *undecumque*. For the Phaedrian plural with *genus* cf. III. 10. 24 '*dum concursant familia.*'

21 Restored largely from Wiss. *tant'is autem ueniis erat pulsus inenarrabilis*, but R contributes also *qui ut uenas considerauerunt pulsum sanum ut uiderunt*. For more on this and the next line see below.

22 R gives *suaserunt ei sumere cibum aliquem qui leuis esset et tolletet fastidium pro digestionem* (the *Vetus* '*cibum solutionis*', scilicet *stomachi* as Pliny), Wiss. *suadetur sumere cibum aliquem in quietem et qui ei leuaret fastidium*. *suadere cibum* is to be compared with *suadere pacem, parsimoniam*, etc., *cibus* being almost a verbal substantive. See the examples in the *Thesaurus* III. 1041.

23 *cuncta—tyrannis=ut regibus omnia lice(n)t* Wiss. R (omitted in the *Vetus*); the sentiment being general, the *oratio recta* is allowed. For *tyrannus* cf. I. 2. 5, V. 1. 14. *at leo* (accepted by Thiele) one of the R MSS., with *ut—licent* following, the rest *ille* or *at ille* (omitted by Wiss.). All add *inquit*.

24 *ignola est mihi inquit simii caro. hanc uellem ignoro—quid sit hanc* (l. *hic*) *sapor* Wiss., *ign. e. inq. mihi c. simii* (-ae the *Vetus*), *uellem hanc probare* R (the *Vetus* adding *si bene uerteretur*). For the *simii sapor* cf. III. 4. 3 sq.

25 *ut est locutus* R Wiss., which is metrically possible, but the practice of Phaedrus is to qualify *locutus* with *sic* or *ita* (*atque ita locutus* I. 22. 9).

The rendering of the conclusion by the paraphrasts is most instructive. *statim necatur beniloquus simius* R (*simia boniloquax* the *Vetus*), *statim rapuit* (fr. *rapitur*) *bene loquens simius* offeretur (corruption of *aufertur*, a doublet of *rapitur*) *ut regi erat iussum* (indication of the case of *locuto*) *et statim laniatus ab eo* (a paraphrast's amplification) Wiss. A different addition in R (except the *Vetus*) *ut eius carnem cito in escam sumeret*. The various late Latin substitutes for *blandus* are noteworthy. At the end R, not Wiss., gives *una enim* (*et ita una* the *Vetus*) *poena est loquentis et non loquentis* (*tacensis* the *Vetus*).

The discrepancy between R and Wiss. as to the adjective of *pulsus* in v. 19 raises an interesting question. There seems little doubt that Phaedrus's narration is coloured by conscious or unconscious reminiscence of one of the best-known tales of medical insight in ancient times, which has left its mark even on so late a composition as the *Aegritudo Perdicae* (Baehrens *P.L.M.* V. 112 sqq.), the similarity of which to our passage is noted by Thiele.¹ How Erasistratus, the physician of Seleucus Nicator, detected the wasting passion of the king's son Antiochus for Stratonice, his father's wife, the beautiful daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes, we know from accounts and allusions in many writers; see e.g. the article 'Erasistratus,' in Pauly-Wissowa or Smith's Dictionary of Biography. Here I need only quote what may throw light upon the meaning or expressions of Phaedrus.

Erasistratus, it is said, discovered the truth, which the prince had done his best to conceal, by the change in the patient's physical condition when the Queen entered the sick chamber, including all the symptoms of violent affection described in the famous ode of Sappho, ἐγίνετο τὰ τῆς Σαπφούς ἐκεῖνα περὶ αὐτὸν πάντα, φωνῆς ἐπίσχεσις, ἐρύθημα πυρῶδες, ὄψεων ὑπολείψεις, ἰδῶτες ὁξεῖς, ἀταξία καὶ θόρυβος ἐν τοῖς σφυγμοῖς, Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 39; 'intrante enim Stratonice et rursus abeunte brachium adulescentis dissimulanter adprehendendo modo uegetiore modo languidiore pulsu uenarum comperit cuius morbi aeger esset,' Valerius Maximus V. vii. Ext. 1; *Aegritudo Perdicae*, 143 sqq. (the doctors summoned to prescribe for Perdica's malady), 'inueniunt iuuenem postrema clade grauatum | et primum quaerunt quae causa laboris inesset; | post uena est temptata; sed haec pulsusque quietus': ib. 167 sqq., 'ingreditur mater. tum quae fuit ante tenenti | mitis et in lentos motus aequaliter acta, | improbitur digitos quatiens pulsatibus urguet.' Now what does the sardonic fabulist intend us to understand was the state of the Lion's pulse when it was felt (tactis uenis²) by His Majesty's medical advisers? Was it beating wildly with the desire and the prospect of immediate gratification, the lust of blood in the monarch (who, it should be remembered, typifies the most sanguinary of tyrants, Commodus excepted, that ever ruled over the Roman world) being excited to uncontrollable fury by the actual

¹ 'Die Konsultation wird mit ähnlichen Ausdrücken in der *Aegritudo Perdicae* 169 beschrieben womöglich nach gemeinsamer

Vorlage,' p. 241.

² Cf. Pers. S. 3. 107 sq. 'lange miser uenas.'

presence of
the inenar
nec eloqu
greater in
Lucan 1.
this case
beyond th
due to th
MSS. of P
the result

There
the readin
sanum,' as
what his
('fastidiu
the situat
of his cas
τεκμήρασ
εἰκασεν εἰ
pulsus nec

One
tyrannis,
connect v
twist to a
incident.
θανάσαι

Before
a possible
acquaint
lost poem
in which
of the fab
understo

I tal
I have gi
IV.
N. H. 18
Phae
V. 2
contemp

LIVER
De

presence of its object? If so, we shall accept the *infandum* which underlies the *inenarrabilis* of Wiss.; compare the gloss 'infandum. inenarrandum nec eloquendum,' *Corp. Gl.* IV. 525, 41. *infandus* then will express with greater intensity the same idea as 'improbus' *Aegritudo Perdicacae* l.c. *improbiter*; Lucan 1. 629 '(fibrarum) pars micat et celeri uenas mouet improba pulsu.' In this case R's *sanum* is explicable either as a conscious alteration of something beyond the knowledge and comprehension of the scribe, or as a corruption due to the omission of *in* after 'pulsum,' a phenomenon common enough in MSS. of Phaedrus (see *Classical Quarterly* XII. p. 91), and the slight change of the resulting *fādum* to *fanum*.

There is however another possibility; which, it must be admitted, leaves the reading of Wiss. unaccounted for. Phaedrus may have written 'pulsum *sanum*,' as R have given. Then there was no fever in the Lion's pulse, and what his physicians were asked to prescribe for was 'loss of appetite' ('fastidium'), which had to be removed by a tempting chance of diet. If so, the situation would be parallel to an earlier incident in Erasistratus's conduct of his case, Appian *Syriaca* 59, οὐδ' ὁ περιώνυμος ἰατρὸς Ερασίστρατος . . . εἶχε, τεκμήρασθαι τοῦ πάθους μέχρι φυλάξας καθαρὸν ἐκ πάντων τὸ σῶμα εἵκασεν εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν νόσον. Compare *Aegr. Perd.* 156, 'non isti calor est pulsus nec uena minatur' and following lines. I leave the decision to the reader.

One concluding remark. It looks as though in the words *cuncta ut licent tyrannis*, which I gather from Thiele some of the paraphrasts not unnaturally connect with the Lion's subsequent behaviour (25), Phaedrus had given an evil twist to a thought which appeared in the current account of the Stratonice incident. Compare what we find in Appian op. cit. 60 init. Σελεύκου δὲ θαυμάσαντος εἰ τινα μὴ δύναίτο πείσαι Σέλευκος ὁ τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλεὺς.

Before leaving the subject perhaps I had better add a word to obviate a possible misunderstanding by readers of the *Classical Quarterly* who are not acquainted with Herr Thiele's work. Its object is not to restore the text of lost poems of Phaedrus, but to reconstitute a medieval collection of prose fables, in which were included amongst others a number of pieces based on the work of the fabulist; and, when I speak of his 'accepting' a reading, this is to be understood to mean that he 'accepts' it for the original text of this collection.

I take the opportunity of adding some passages in support of two readings I have given in the *Fabulae* already published in this *Journal*.

IV. 4. (*Class. Quart.* XII. p. 156) *securi aptato* (manubrio). Compare Pliny *N. H.* 18. 236, 'manubria aptare,' Columella 11. 2. 92.

Phaedrus uses the verb with a dative in IV. 15. 7.

V. 2. *glanDEM cenat*. For this expression compare Seneca, Phaedrus's contemporary, *Dial.* 1. 3. 6, 'ad focum cenat illas ipsas radices et herbas.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

LIVERPOOL.

December 21, 1918.

NOTE ON 'CONSPICIOR' IN LIV. X. 43.

IN connexion with the note on *conspicior*, Liv. X. 43, in the last volume of *Classical Quarterly*, pp. 116 ff., where it is argued that this verb often conveys a suggestion of self-conscious feeling, it may be interesting to remark the use of *conspetus* in *Aen.* VIII. 588:

ipse agmine Pallas
in medio, chlamyde et pictis *conspetus* in armis.

The suggestion of self-consciousness would, I think, be very appropriate here. The young warrior in his splendid armour attracts everyone's attention, and is proudly conscious of the fact—a touch of human nature quite in Vergil's manner. I am not aware whether editors have drawn any attention to this point, but it seems worth noticing.

G. J. CLEMENS.

GORDON SCHOOLS, HUNTLY,
ABERDEENSHIRE.

CORRIGENDA.

IN Mr. F. H. Colson's article on 'The Analogist and Anomalist Controversy' (*C. Q.*, January, 1919, pp. 24-36) the following corrections should be made:

P. 27, note 5. Read '*Ib.* VIII. 42.'

P. 28, line 12 from foot. For συλλαβῶν read συμφώνον.

P. 28, note 4. For παραλήγουσα read παρατέλευτος.

IN the
Professor
Glossary.
with givi
Glossary
dictionary
(i.e., inclu
Virginita
Erfurt GL
the three
had befor
Glossary,
additions,
This
it can po
appear ov
must hav
and when
inflexiona
that, even
certain th
small.

I hav
who have
opinion th
Aldhelm
ment, aft
existence
standing
arrive at
that many
of the sev

¹ I adopt
prose treati

REMARKS ON THE CORPUS GLOSSARY.

I.—THE ALDHELM PROBLEM.

IN the Introduction to his *Old English Glosses*, published in 1900, the late Professor Napier asserted that Aldhelm glosses are to be found in the Corpus Glossary. He did not attempt any elaborate argument, but contented himself with giving a list of sixty-four instances in which the lemmata of the Corpus Glossary (none of the words, it is important to remark, being in the normal dictionary form, but all in inflexional forms differing from this) coincide entirely (i.e., including the inflexions) with words occurring in the text of the *De Virginitate*.¹ Of these lemmata, twenty-three occur also in the Epinal and Erfurt Glossaries, and must therefore have existed in the common archetype of the three collections. Napier's conclusion was that the compiler of the archetype had before him one Aldhelm glossary, and that the author of the Corpus Glossary, who rearranged the material of the archetype and made extensive additions, had among his sources another and an independent glossary.

This conclusion has been all but universally accepted, and I do not think it can possibly be denied that at first sight the evidence in its favour must appear overwhelming. For the selected lemmata, not being in dictionary form, must have been taken ultimately from one or more consecutive glossed texts; and when we find that no fewer than sixty-four of the words, in their precise inflexional form, occur in the *De Virginitate*, it is difficult to resist the conviction that, even though a good many of the coincidences may be accidental, it is certain that the number of Aldhelm items in the Corpus Glossary is not very small.

I have recently learned, however, that at least two highly competent scholars, who have given special attention to the Corpus Glossary, have come to the opinion that there is little or no real evidence that the collection contains any Aldhelm glosses at all. Now, although I decidedly believe that Napier's argument, after all deductions are made, retains sufficient force to establish the existence of an Aldhelmian element in the Glossary, I have no difficulty in understanding how it may be possible for a qualified and careful investigator to arrive at a different conclusion. An inspection of Napier's list shows at once that many of the words enumerated are not very uncommon in the literature of the seventh century and earlier periods, occurring in texts or glossaries to

¹ I adopt this form of the title of the prose treatise, in order to prevent confusion in the references with the metrical *De Laudibus Virginum*.

which the compiler of the Corpus Glossary and the compiler of the archetype of the portions common to Epinal, Erfurt, and Corpus unquestionably had access. Further, the coincidences in inflexion, on which Napier (quite rightly, in my opinion) lays especial stress, lose much of their evidential force when we reflect that not seldom the particular oblique case or verbal form cited is the very shape in which the word is likely to have most frequently occurred. And even when one of the words in Napier's list is excessively rare, or (as in one or two instances) has hitherto been found in no other text than the *De Virginitate*, we must remember that Aldhelm above all other men was an amateur of lexical rarities, and is likely to have industriously sought for them in the very sources that were used by the compilers of our glossaries. Lastly, I believe there is no doubt that now and then a lemma of the Corpus Glossary which shows a striking coincidence with a word in Aldhelm's treatise is found, in the same inflected form, in some other text which *a priori* is at least equally likely to have been the source. I hope it will not be deemed impertinent to suggest that the investigation that has led to the negative conclusion has not been wholly unbiassed. This involves no reproach, because, on account of certain chronological difficulties to which I shall afterwards advert, some degree of negative bias on this question is not only excusable but justifiable. However this may be, when a person has gone carefully through a long series of alleged items of evidence, and found that individually they have very little weight, it is not easy for him to do justice to the cumulative value they may possess; he 'cannot see the wood for the trees.' I am inclined to think that the verdict of a strictly impartial person, who had nothing before him but Napier's list of coincidences, might be that, while the existence of a considerable Aldhelmian element in the Glossary may be accepted as proved, it would be difficult to show dependence on Aldhelm for more than a very few individual lemmata.

Beyond this not very satisfactory conclusion we can hardly hope to advance, unless some new method of attacking the problem can be discovered. Such a method it is the object of this paper to suggest and to apply.

The starting-point of my inquiry was the document printed in Wright-Wülcker 485³⁰—535¹¹ (the third part of the MS. Cleopatra, A iii.),¹ to which I shall refer hereafter as 'Cleop.' It is a glossary to Aldhelm, not alphabetical nor classified, but following the order in which the words occur in the Latin text.

This Aldhelm glossary affords a solution (which to me appears beyond reasonable doubt) of one of the most hopeless-looking puzzles in the Corpus Glossary—the entry A 580, 'Anastasis: diligenessum.' It has been widely recognized that the OE. word must be a corruption of *digelnessum*, dat. pl. of *digelness*, secret place; but why this word should be given as a rendering of *anastasis* is a question which no one has hitherto been able to answer, though the gloss 'De recessibus: . . . of digelnessum,' in the Digby MS. of Aldhelm, did look

¹ This MS., in addition to the valuable Aldhelm glossary which I cite as Cleop., contains the alphabetical glossary WW., 338—472, with

which I am not here concerned. It is highly important that the two should not be confused.

tantalizing
has the l
De Anast
does not
Corpus w
to Cleop.
preceded
the gloss
saint's na
lemma.
English g
de recess
glossaries

If th
item in th
section of
chapter x
derived fr
dences be
is at any
to be. I v
section wh
common t
additions
identical o
which hav
in Aldhel
dictionary
tives in -u
inflected f
sing. fem.

(a) pa
mancum, p
(β) run
commate, i
prodigio, in
cinnabant,
immunem, r
molientes, c
retur, garru
intercapedine.

Now I
reserves as

¹ The blank
portion of Cle
section of the

tantalizingly suggestive of a clue. To my great surprise, I found that Cleop. has the lemma *de recessibus* (though with a different gloss) in a section headed *De Anastasio* (this is really an absurd blunder for *De Athanasio*;¹ but the error does not affect the present point). It now appears that one of the sources of Corpus was a MS. of Aldhelmian *glossae collectae*, similar in general character to Cleop. In this MS. the top line of a page was 'De recessibus: of digelnessum,' preceded in the margin by the name Anastasius, in order to save the user of the glossary the trouble of turning back. The compiler of Corpus mistook the saint's name for the well-known word *anastasis*, which he supposed to be the lemma. As the line was inconveniently long, he thought that since there was an English gloss the Latin one might be dispensed with, and he therefore omitted *de recessibus*; and finally, by a kind of slip which is extremely common in glossaries of the period, he turned *digelnessum* into *dilignessum*.

If this solution be accepted, the conclusion is inevitable that at least one item in the Corpus Glossary was obtained from *glossae collectae* relating to the section of the *De Virginitate* concerned with Athanasius—the second half of chapter xxxii. We have now to ask whether any other Corpus lemmata are derived from the same portion of Aldhelm's text. The number of correspondences between words in this section of Aldhelm and words glossed in Corpus is at any rate surprisingly large, whatever their evidential value may turn out to be. I will give a list, divided into two groups, of the words occurring in this section which are found (*a*) in the oldest part of the collection (viz., the portion common to the Corpus, Epinal, and First Erfurt Glossaries), and (*β*) in the additions peculiar to Corpus. I print in italics those words which appear in identical oblique or inflected form in the two places, using roman type for those which have the dictionary form in Corpus, whatever shape the word may have in Aldhelm. It should be remarked that in the Corpus Glossary the normal dictionary form of a verb was not *amo* or *amare*, but *amat*; and that for adjectives in *-us*, *-a*, *-um* the neuter was often taken as the typical form. Also, an inflected feminine adjective is often represented in the Glossary by the nom. sing. fem.

(*a*) palmitibus, *percrebruit*, glareis, serio, strophas, *commentis*, inlectus, stibio, mancum, penitus, insimulare, testudine, aemulorum, torquebantur.

(*β*) rumigerula, praeconia, cardines, altor, *cunabulorum* (cur- in Cp.), *characteres*, commate, ilia, abstrusum, latrinae, cuniculum, tropeo, fastigio, aetatula, *indolis*, prodigio, inuestes (= beardless), portenderit, decretis, *insontem*, subdola, *factione*, concinnabant, euulsum, adstipulatur, *scaptra*, *lacertum*, *sarcofago*, necromantia, *probrosis*, immunem, reatum, facinoribus, sospitem, neruorum, nexibus, huiuscemodi, confutati, molientes, comminiscuntur, prostituta, pallax, prostibuli, stupro, pubertate, machinaretur, garrulitatis, incestum (subst.), ulnarum, gremiis, procax, *defenditur*, profugus, *intercapedine*, latebra, potiretur, adamante, rigidiore, inrogabat.

Now I am quite aware that this list must be taken with the same kind of reserves as I have admitted to be necessary in estimating the value of Napier's

¹ The blunder, strange to say, recurs in the portion of Cleop. dealing with the corresponding section of the poetical *De Laudibus Virginum*.

From the apparatus criticus in Ehwald's edition, it appears not to be found in any extant MS. of Aldhelm.

list of correspondences between Corpus and the whole text of the *De Virginitate*; indeed, with far greater reserves, because all but a very few of the words above quoted appear in Corpus in their dictionary form, and not in the inflected forms in which they occur in Aldhelm. In all probability very many of the coincidences are accidental. But, after all, when we find that $14 + 59 = 73$ lemmata of Corpus are identical with words occurring in a single section¹ of Aldhelm which occupies 41 lines in Ehwald's edition—a section, moreover, which we know to have furnished *one* item to the Corpus Glossary—there does seem an excess of scepticism in refusing the inference that the obligations of Corpus to glosses on this section are probably somewhat considerable. It may be quite true that not one of these 73 lemmata can be confidently affirmed to have come from this source; but it is equally true that there is not one of them for which such an origin can with absolute certainty be denied. A good many of the words seem to have been special favourites of Aldhelm; but while this diminishes the probability that a Corpus item is a gloss on this particular chapter, it only strengthens the general likelihood of its being an Aldhelm gloss.

Before I proceed further with this method of argument, I wish to interject the remark that the contention that a particular item in Corpus is an Aldhelm gloss is not necessarily disproved, or even rendered less likely, by showing that the explanation is taken from some lexicographical work older than the seventh century, and that it was suggested by some particular context in an ancient writer. For the glossators on Aldhelm did not draw their explanations from the stores of their own learning. When a glossator was not acquainted with a word which it was his duty to explain, and did not (as he too often did) venture to guess its meaning from the context, he would naturally look it up in a dictionary. The compiler of Corpus, incorporating in his work the *glossae collectae* on Aldhelm, would inevitably include many explanations which, if we did not know their intermediate source, we might suppose him to have copied directly from the ancient vocabularies in which we find them. Aldhelm himself, for all we know, may have learnt the Latin words from these same ancient vocabularies, which were among the school-books of his youth; or he may himself have read and remembered the passages on which the explanations were founded. For our purpose it does not matter how Aldhelm got hold of the words. Anyhow, he introduced them in his text, and the glossators had to explain them as best they could. There are at least five more or less independent interlined in MS. Digby 146; the second in other MSS. used by Napier; the third interlined in MS. Digby 146, the second in other MSS. used by Napier; the third is preserved in Cleop. We shall find reason to believe that there were two

¹ To preclude a possible misapprehension, I may point out that the misunderstood *Anastasius* in the Aldhelmian *glossae collectae* used in Corpus was not the heading of the section (if it had been that it would have been *De Anastasio*), but a catchword at the top left-hand corner of a page, indicating that the section is continued

from the preceding page. Instead, therefore, of proving that '*De recessibus*: of digelnessum' was the first item of the section, and thus ruling out most of the correspondences noted above, this catchword really proves just the contrary. In Cleop., it may be remarked, '*De recessibus*' comes twenty-sixth in the section.

By errors in printing on pp. 92 and 96 of the issue of the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY for April, 1919, parts of Dr. Bradley's article have unfortunately been made unintelligible. Readers are therefore requested to cut out (within the black lines) the passages printed below, and to gum them over the original passages. In each case the top and bottom lines are already correct, but it will probably be found easier to attach the wider strips of paper.

P. 92, the four lines at the foot of the text :

explain them as best they could. There are at least five more or less independent sets of glosses on the *De Virginitate*. Three of these are extant: one is interlined in MS. Digby 146; the second in other MSS. used by Napier; the third is preserved in Cleop. We shall find reason to believe that there were two

P. 96, lines 10 to 13 :

puted, but I think the source shows that it stands for *giernde*, equivalent to Gronovius's *dilexerat*; the glossator of MS. Digby 146 adopts the commonplace explanation '*iudicauerat*,' which does not well suit the context; what Cleop. means by its rendering '*figurabat*' I do not clearly understand.

others (ma
it is not c
used, some
Erfurt, and
the redact
any of his
motive for
as would
some of th
the materi
of glosses
selections
choose. I
he did not
space on c
bility mee
to waste l
given a g
tives; he
infer that
(I may be
be useful.
twice; but
word, this
of correcti

My re
the startin
a particul
Indeed, th
force conv
only a fe
what follo
copy out
glosses on
in the *MG*

Ch. X

30¹⁰. nec

pu

lasci

ta

titill

bi

¹ I do not
Strictis: g

others (mainly independent, but showing occasional points of contact, which it is not easy to account for, with Digby or with Cleop.). One of these was used, somewhat sparingly, in the archetype of the common portion of Epinal, Erfurt, and Corpus; the other, much more extensively, in the additions made by the redactor of Corpus. I find no reason to believe that the redactor obtained any of his material *directly* from the ancient vocabularies. He had, indeed, no motive for doing so. His purpose was evidently to produce such a dictionary as would be useful to students of the texts ordinarily read—the Bible, Virgil, some of the Fathers, Orosius, Aldhelm, and others. For this practical end all the material he was likely to need was to be found in glossed MSS., or collections of glosses on these authors. If he had tried to supplement this material by selections from ancient vocabularies, he would have been at a loss what items to choose. Perhaps he might have gone on the principle of taking such words as he did not happen to understand; but then he would be in danger of wasting space on curiosities like *topper* and *antigerio*, which nobody would by any possibility meet with in his reading. And that he had a business-like anxiety not to waste his space is apparent from several indications. Thus, when he has given a gloss on a primary word, he does not usually add the obvious derivatives; he will give you the meaning of *alga*, but will leave to your own wit to infer that of *algosus*, though the latter occurs in a chapter of Aldhelm from which (I may be allowed to anticipate here) he has taken every gloss that was likely to be useful. It is true that he often by inadvertence repeats a gloss once or even twice; but as his arrangement is alphabetical only for the first two letters of a word, this mistake was not easy to avoid, and he had not the modern resource of correcting blunders in proof.

My reason for beginning with the section *De Athanasio* was that it had been the starting-point of my own investigations; not at all that I believed it to afford a particularly good sample of the evidence on which my conclusion is based. Indeed, there are very many other sections which seem to be much more likely to force conviction on an unwilling mind. Of course it is possible for me to give only a few examples. It will perhaps be less tedious and more effective if in what follows I adopt a different mode of presentation. I will in the first place copy out one or two passages of Aldhelm, confronting them with the Corpus glosses on the words which they contain. I quote from the edition by Ehwald in the *MGH.*, but give reference to page and line of Giles's edition:

CH. XXVI.

30 ¹⁰ . nec pudeat, Christi <i>caelibes</i> strictis ¹	N 337	Celebs. sine uxore uir
pudicitiae legibus		
lasciuam naturae petulantiam coar-	(P 226	Petulans. lasciuus.)
tantes corporeosque		
titillationum <i>gestus</i> uelut <i>indomitos</i>	G 41	Gestus. gebero (<i>plural</i>)
<i>bigarum</i> subiugales	I 427	Indomitus. welde
	B 115	Bigae. ubi duo equi curru subiunguntur

¹ I do not italicize this word, because S 536, *Strictis: getogenum*, although it is an Aldhelm

gloss, belongs to 'strictis mucronibus' in 52¹⁸.

<i>ferratis salinaribus refrenantes Toronici reminisci</i>	S 44	Salibaribus. mißlum
<i>pontificis; quem antequam . . . baptismatis rudimenta cognosceret, in catacuminorum gradu et competentium statu stipem pauperculis porrigentem agapemque egentibus erogantem, . . . caeleste beaui oraculum, quique pro adepta integritatis corona et fausta uirginitatis infula,</i>	Int. 251 R 217 C 74 S 511 A 405 O 241	Pontifex. episcopus Rudimenta. initia. tirocinia Catecominus. deforis audiens Stipem. elemosinam Agapem. suoesendo Oraculum. responsum. diuinitus
<i>quas uelut regale diadema ac gemmatas crepundiorum lunulas indefessis uiribus meta tenus seruare satagebat,</i>	A 197 F 6 I 98 D 221 C 889 L 277 M 127 S 61	Adeptus. adsecutus Faustus. iocundus Infula. uueorðmynd Diadema. uit <t>a regalis Crepundium. monile gutturis Lunulus (read -as). mene. scillingas Meta. finis Satagit. deliberat. cogitat. uel omnia peragit
<i>miris uirtutum signis effulsisse memoratur.</i>		

CH. LII.

68 ²⁷ . <i>praedictas uirgines nulla persecutorum rabies, nulla poenarum acerbitas ab integritatis arce detrudere ualuerunt, sed omne patrimonium et ornamentorum gloriam tam discriminabilia capitum et periscelides crurum quum olfactoriola nardi et crepundia collo gemmiferis lunulis pendentia ad stipem mancis et matriculariis prodiga liberalitate contulerunt.</i>	R 16 A 164 A 792 D 169 P 2 D 301 P 330 O 140 N 28 C 887 N 277 S 510 M 8 P 583 L 244	Rabies. geris Aceruitas. dolor. crudelitas Arce. eminentia Detrudit. excludit Patrimonium. gestrion Discriminabilia. capitis ornamentum Periscelidus. crurum ornatus Olfactoriola. uasa. insimilae Nardus. genus odoris optimi Crepundia. maenoe. Lunulus. mene. scillingas Stipem. elemosinam Mancus. anheni Prodigus. profusus. largus. Liberalitas. roopnis
---	---	--

As in illustration of the first of these two extracts I have taken one gloss from the 'Interpretatio,' I may remark here that the two works composing the Corpus Glossary, the 'Interpretatio Nominum' and the 'Glosa,' were probably prepared concurrently, and that (both works being arranged alphabetically) the compiler several times inadvertently inserted an item in the wrong collection.¹

But I really must get on more rapidly. I will now give, in as summary a

¹ I have not fully investigated the relation between the second and third Erfurt Glossaries and the Corpus Glossary. My provisional hypothesis with regard to this allows me to treat the

entries common to these glossaries and Corpus as on the same level with those peculiar to Corpus; and I do not think any error can result from my doing so.

fashion as to which the Glossary.

Chapter as a prolog words it cor are used to them too w way, is left

Chapter and 71 of i in the Glos These latter been once i flagris and significant.

Chapter explained in enucleata, a which in Co altrinsecus,

For a l at random Corpus. In membrorum chapter by i explodet, g

The lis glosses, and extremely s vocabulary) course the g of Corpus v used by Al the items in such exam and several glosses in C tive. It cou are perhaps 'Exalaparet (= Giles 27 glosses in dictionaries

fashion as possible, a few more illustrations of the extraordinarily great extent to which the vocabulary of the treatise *De Virginitate* is to be found in the Corpus Glossary.

Chapter I. of Giles's edition is in the *MGH.* edition printed in large capitals as a prologue or dedication, and there occupies eleven lines. Fifteen of the words it contains are explained in the words in the Corpus Glossary; several more are used to explain other words, so that we may presume the glossator thought them too well known to need explanation. This chapter or dedication, by the way, is left unglossed both in MS. Digby and in Cleop.

Chapter II. of Giles's edition (= I. and II. *MGH.*) fills 26 lines in *MGH.*, and 71 of its words are glossed in Corpus, not including several which appear in the Glossary in inflexional forms other than those found in this chapter. These latter presumably come from non-Aldhelmian sources, but when they had been once inserted the compiler would of course not repeat them. The words *flagris* and *portisculo* show coincidence in an oblique case; the latter is especially significant.

Chapter IV. occupies in *MGH.* 33 lines, and includes 74 words that are explained in Corpus, which has the following in their inflected forms: *corimbos*, *cnucleata*, *anagogen*, *cola*, *commata*, *pentemimerin*, *eptemimerin*. Among those which in Corpus appear in their dictionary form are *catalecticis*, *brachicatalecticis*, *altrinsecus*, *allegoria*, *tropologia*, *tonus* (glossed 'accentus').

For a last example of the results of this sort of statistical comparison I chose at random Chapter XX., which occupies 25 lines, and has 42 words glossed as Corpus. Inflected forms in this chapter which are retained in Corpus are *secreti*, *membrorum*, *in propatulo*. Among the lemmata of Corpus represented in the chapter by inflected forms are such words as *penticontarchus*, *exametron*, *uctigal*, *explodet*, *gannatura*, *insultans*, *subfocat*, *incunabulum*, *promulgat* (MS.—it.).

The list of words in the *De Virginitate* which are likely to have required glosses, and are absent from the Corpus Glossary, would comparatively be extremely short. The man who (knowing the peculiar character of Aldhelm's vocabulary) can believe this to be the effect of chance can believe anything. Of course the greatest weight as evidence belongs to the instances in which a lemma of Corpus which is not in dictionary form coincides inflexionally with a word used by Aldhelm. Of these Professor Napier adduced 64, and though most of the items in his list have only a cumulative value, this objection hardly applies to such examples as *archiatros*, *indruticans*, *mirifillo*, *saluaribus*, *stricta macerā*, and several others. But Napier's list was confined to words that have OE. glosses in Corpus, and even within its limits made no pretence of being exhaustive. It could be very extensively supplemented; and some of the items omitted are perhaps more striking than any of those included. I will cite only two: 'Exalaparetur suungen <waere>' (= Giles 58⁴), and 'Taxauerat. gierende' (= Giles 27¹⁴). One might almost let the case for the existence of Aldhelm glosses in Corpus rest on the evidence of these two specimens alone. The dictionaries give only one reference for *exalapo*; the Latin *Thesaurus*, when it

reaches the word, may produce more, but I do not think the examples of the 3rd sing. subj. impf. passive will be numerous. *Taxo* is common enough, but *taxauerat* is surely rare. Aldhelm's use of the verb in the passage referred to is somewhat peculiar. He says, in effect: 'If Clement even in his heathen days had so greatly valued (*tantopere taxauerat*) the virtue of chastity, how much more may we expect that when he had become a Christian he would be a shining example of it!' The word was a stumbling-block to A. Gronovius, whose proposed reading *dilexerat* is very bad as a textual correction, but a very good shot at the contextual sense. The meaning of the OE. gloss *gierende* has been much disputed, but I think the source shows that it stands for *giernde*, equivalent to explanation 'iudicauerat,' which does not well suit the context; what Cleop. explanation 'judicauerat,' which does not well suit the context; what Cleop. means by its rendering 'figurabat' I do not clearly understand.

It may perhaps have occurred to the reader that if the Corpus Glossary abounds in Aldhelm glosses to the extent that I suppose, we ought sometimes to meet with a consecutive series of them, approximately in the order in which they occur in the text. The test seems fair enough, and perhaps no one will deny that if it is successfully borne a point will have been scored for my contention. Too much must not be expected, for the arrangement being alphabetical for the first two letters of a word and not for the initial only, there will not often be room for very long batches of words from the same source, and allowance must be made for transpositions and afterthoughts. I have not thoroughly studied this question, but the following example of consecution could hardly be bettered. (I give the numbers of the Corpus items in Hessels' edition, and references to page and line of Giles's edition of Aldhelm.)

S 41 Sagax. gleu.	213 sagaces gimnosofistas
42 Salpicum. tubarum	233 salpicum clangor
43 Sarmentum. spraec.	235 sarmentorumque nutrimine
44 Salibaribus. midlum	3013 saliaribus refrenantes
45 Sarcofago. licbeorg	3927 in sarcofago
46 Sacellorum. haerga	2538 sacellorum lustramenta
47 Salamandra. animal quod <d> am uiuens in igne	4223 salamandras, quas . . . prunarum globi cremare nequeunt

In this sequence of seven glosses only one is out of place. I may add that the two preceding lemmata, S 39 *salunca*, and S 40 *salix*, are words used by Aldhelm, but as they occur in his verse, and as the glosses come from the archetype, and not, as do the following seven, from the redactor of Corpus, they are irrelevant to my argument.

Although I have not attempted to present more than a small portion of the evidence, I venture to hope that impartial readers are now satisfied that glosses on the *De Virginitate* are abundant in the Corpus Glossary. It remains to determine whether, as at the outset of my investigation I expected to find, they are almost entirely confined to the additions made by the latest redactor, or whether, as Napier thought, they exist in considerable number in the original

nucleus re
Napier wa
those in th

The i
the Epina
the later a
the roman
ally for th
the gloss i

In the
B section
items, how
compiler e
mind to us
letter C th
long series
used by A
the words
the archet
material, i
meaning, t
argument
with refere

VI. c. 14
15 C
16 C

17 C
18 C
19 C
20 C
21 C
22 C

23 C
24 C

25 C
26 C
27 C

VI. c. 28 C
29 C
30 C

¹ There ap
referring to

nucleus represented by Epinal and Erfurt. I have no longer any doubt that Napier was right. The Aldhelm glosses in the archetype are less numerous than those in the additions, but they are far more abundant than I expected.

The investigation of this question must be based not on the Corpus but on the Epinal Glossary, which substantially represents the original work without the later additions and transpositions. In my references to the Epinal Glossary, the roman numeral stands for the page of the facsimile, the letters *a, b, c* severally for the three (double) columns, and the arabic figures for the numbers of the gloss in the column.¹

In the A section of the Epinal Glossary I find about 30 lemmas, and in the B section about 10, which are identical with words used by Aldhelm. These items, however, seem to me so inconclusive, that I am led to surmise that the compiler either had not access to the Aldhelm glosses, or did not make up his mind to use them, until he had completed the B section. When we come to the letter C the case is completely altered. At the very beginning we come upon a long series of glosses consisting, with rare exceptions, of explanations of words used by Aldhelm. It is true that they are not arranged in the order in which the words occur in the text; and although there are signs that the compiler of the archetype of the three glossaries had made some re-arrangement of his material, including sporadic attempts at classification according to affinities of meaning, this is unquestionably a very serious abatement from the value of my argument (see my Postscript). I will now give the first 25 entries in the C section, with references to the page and line of Giles's edition of Aldhelm:

VI. c. 14	<I> conisma: picta imago.	81 ¹¹ iconisma
15	Colonus; gibuur.	10 ³⁶ (and elsewhere) colonus
16	Cellis: apothecis	(A Virgil gloss: see Servius on <i>Geo. II. 96</i>)
17	Contribulus: meeg	2 ³¹ contribulium. 38 ²¹ contribulibus
18	Cistulla: sporta	
19	Calcis: finis	65 ¹² ante calcem uoluminis
20	Calculus: calc	138 ²⁰ calculus ardens
21	Clibosum: clibecti	
22	Constillatio: notatio siderum	35 ³⁷ iuxta mathematicorum constellationem
23	Censor: dignitas iudicialis	
24	Censere: iudicare	(9 ²⁵ censeo; 151 ² censebant; but the inf. is not the 'dictionary form.')
25	Ciliarchus: qui mille praeest	31 ⁴ chiliarcho, id est tribuno militum
26	Colobium: ham	51 ²³ colobium
27	Cene: grece nouum	
VI. c. 28	Cyatus: calix	
29	Caccabum: cetil	66 ¹⁸ caccabos
30	Cauea: domus in theatro	49 ³ cauearum (so MSS.; Giles absurdly <i>cauernarum</i> ; the meaning is 'dens' in the arena).

¹ There appears to be no accepted mode of referring to this glossary. Sweet's numeration

in *O.E.T.* omits the purely Latin glosses, and is therefore unavailable for the present purpose.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 31 Coniuentia : consensio | 49 ³⁴ coniuentia |
| 32 Cuniculum : foramen uel canalis | 39 ²⁷ cuniculum |
| 33 Cudat : ¹ fabricat | 156 ²² cuderet |
| 34 Coccum bis tinctum : uilloc-read | 15 ³⁴ bis tincto cocco (from Exod. xxvi. 1) |
| (35 and 36 are Bible glosses) | |
| 37 Cintia : luna | 136 ²⁴ noctem Cynthia comit |
| 38 Calculus : ratio uel sententia uel tebelstan | 44 ²² nec calculo computari . . . ualet |

Here we come to the bottom of a page, and the sequence of Aldhelm glosses is broken by 35 items mainly from other sources, though among them are a few Aldhelmian words, including the characteristic *cittis*. Then follows another Aldhelm series :

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| VII. a 36 Catapulta : sagittae | 59 ²³ catapultas de falsitatis faretra prolatas |
| 37 Cercylus : aesc uel nauis | 10 ²⁷ cercilo |
| b 1 Cluat : nobilitat | |
| 2 Chaos : duolma | 34 ²¹ chaos |
| 3 Conquiliium : uilucscel | 75 ¹⁶ rubro conquiliis sanguine |
| 4 Cauillatio : iocus cum uicio | 63 ¹¹ cauillatione |
| 5 Conopeum : rete muscarum | 76 ²⁹ conopeo |

The following 37 glosses contain nothing that is necessarily Aldhelmian, but after these we come to a short batch showing some remarkable coincidences :

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| VII. e 6 Crudiscente : inualiscente. | 67 ⁸ crudescente |
| 7 Claua : stegn | 172 ²⁹ clauam |
| 8 Cient : commoueant | 206 ⁵ cient |
| 9 Cerealia : sacra cereris | |
| 10 Conuenio : groetu uel adiuro | |
| 11 Contis : spreotum | 265 ²⁸ contis |
| 12 Ceremonias : ritus sacrificandi | 35 ³⁶ caeremonias |

The next item (Cereacas : tubicines) is an unmistakable Orosius gloss, and the following 80 glosses seem to be from other sources than Aldhelm. But then begins another series of 28 items, of which 18 are Aldhelmian :

- | | |
|--|--|
| VIII. b 22 C < l > austella : clustorlocae | 56 ¹² clustella |
| 23 Cantarus : genus uassis | |
| 24 Cerula : haeuui | 34 ¹⁹ cerula (often in Aldhelm) |
| (25-27 are not from Aldhelm) | |
| 28 Cataplasma : medicamentum | 26 ³¹ cataplasma |
| 29 Clatrum : pearroc | 49 ⁴ clatrorum |
| 30 Crepundium : monile gutturis | 9 ⁴ crepundia (common in Aldhelm) |
| 31 Cautionem : scriptionem | (? A Bible gloss : Luc. XVI. 6 cautionem) |
| 32 Cautum : scriptum | 31 ²⁸ praesertim cum de illo cautum ² (Giles <i>cantum</i> ?) sit. |
| 33 Cospis : palester | 153 ³¹ cuspidē uexilli |
| 34 Calcar : spora | 59 ²⁵ calcar |
| 35 Cauterium : mear < c > isern | 26 ³⁴ cauterio |

¹ Read *cudit* with Corpus.

² The word is glossed 'scriptum' in Cleop.

36
37

VIII. e (1,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

The r
Aldhelm, a
the rest of
Glossary (;
more Aldh
groups in
in the arch
entry), and
containing

It is no
what exten
differing fr
Corpus red
decessor, o
great impo
ments are s

Hither
except the
treatise, co
poem *De*
Aenigmata
used by the
his additio
this will be
alphabet of
the same m
will take th

¹ I must co
sample, for i
glosses are m
occurring in l

36 Clabatum: gybyrdid	77 ¹⁵ clauatae
37 Choreia, <i>græce</i> : saltatio cum cantilena	
VIII. • (1, 2, probably not from Aldhelm)	
3 Catasta: gloed	63 ² catastarum
4 Celox: ceol	
5 Capsis: cest	138 ¹⁰ capsis
6 Cenox, <i>uel</i> index: testis	
7 Colludium: turpis ludus	193 ²⁹ saeui colludia luxus. 21 ²² colludia
8 Carcesia: summitas mali	
9 Crustu: ornatu	77 ¹¹ crustu
10 Ca<ta>ractis: waeter-thruch	83 ³ cataractis
11 Ceruus: elch	255 ⁶ ceruos
12 Culmen: qui culmis tegitur	47 ³⁰ culmine

The remaining 25 items on this page contain no unequivocal traces of Aldhelm, and after this two leaves of the MS. have been lost, which contained the rest of C and the whole of D and E. So far as I can judge from the Erfurt Glossary (another copy of the same archetype), the original glossary had no more Aldhelm glosses in letter C. A comparison of the length of the Aldhelm groups in this letter with that of the intervening gaps seems to suggest that in the archetype the Aldhelm material was continuous (beginning with the first entry), and that the interruptions are due to the misplacing of two leaves, each containing about 38 or 40 glosses.¹

It is now evident that the compiler of the archetype had before him a somewhat extensive set of *glossae collectae* on Aldhelm, similar to Cleop., though differing from it in the wording of most of the explanations. Whether the Corpus redactor used the *same* collection, gleaning after the harvest of his predecessor, or whether he used an independent collection, is not a question of great importance. I myself believe the latter view is correct; but as the arguments are subtle and might fail to be convincing, I will not here enter upon them.

Hitherto, I have not explicitly referred to any of the works of Aldhelm except the prose *De Virginitate*. But Cleop., in addition to its glosses on this treatise, contains also glosses on the metrical *De Laudibus Virginum* and the poem *De Octo Principalibus Vitiis*, and other MSS. have glosses on the *Aenigmata*. I may be content to say briefly that both the collection of glosses used by the compiler of the archetype, and that used by the Corpus redactor for his additions, drew from MSS. of all these three works. Sufficient evidence of this will be found by anyone who will take the trouble to go through the whole alphabet of the Epinal-Erfurt Glossary, and that of the Corpus additions, in the same manner as I have gone through the C section of Epinal. If anybody will take this trouble, he will be able to form an approximately correct estimate

¹ I must confess that letter C is a very unfair sample, for in every other letter the Aldhelm glosses are much less numerous, and instead of occurring in large blocks are dispersed (as if by

design) among the rest. This may throw an interesting light on the methods of the compiler, but it certainly does not weaken my argument.

of the number of Aldhelm glosses in each of the two strata of the Corpus Glossary.

I will now point out a few instances in which an eccentric rendering in the Corpus Glossary becomes intelligible when we know the context in which the lemma occurs in Aldhelm.

A 495. Albo: penna. This looks mysterious enough, but Aldhelm has two passages, either of which will serve to clear it up. In 41²³ he speaks of Cosmas and Damian as *aethralis litteraturae albo descriptos*. In 61²⁵ he says that S. Eulalia *caelesti inscribitur albo*. The glossator guessed that *caelesti albo* meant 'with a heavenly pen.' The guess was wide of the mark, but it was not silly; for it perfectly fitted the context; and though in fact *album* was not the Latin for a white goosequill, there seems no reason why it might not have been. Compare Aldhelm's riddle *De Penna Scriptoria* 'Me dudum genuit candens onocrotalus albam.' The blunder was not shared either by the glossator of Digby 146 or by the one whose work was excerpted in Cleop.; they both render the word correctly, though they express the meaning differently.

C 460. Clasma: pax uel turba. This curious alternative is explained by reference to Aldhelm 52²⁶: 'Caeteris enim uiolati foederis clasma concorditer reconciliantibus.' Here it might seem doubtful whether *clasma* had the meaning of 'peace' or the very opposite meaning 'disturbance of the peace' (*turba*). I think there can be no reasonable doubt that the word is the Greek *κλάσμα*, though I am not aware that this has been found with the meaning 'breach.' In 197¹⁸ Aldhelm uses *hoc clasma tetrum* apparently for 'this horrible outrage'; and the second Erfurt Glossary renders *clasma* by 'damna.'

N 132. Nonnulli: multi iniusti. In Chapter XXV. of the *De Virginitate* Aldhelm asserts that S. Clement was the immediate successor of S. Peter, 'quanquam nonnulli Linum et An<a>cletum in pontificatus regmine nequiquam praeferant.' Some glossator, thinking that *nonnulli* did not correctly represent the facts, wrote over it *multi iniuste*, 'many persons wrongly.' It was not very usual for a glossator to try to improve his text instead of explaining it; but in this same passage MS. Digby 146 has the gloss *quam plurimi* written over *nonnulli*. Perhaps the opinion rejected by Aldhelm had become more popular since the date of his writing.

R 122. Redi<ui>ua: aettaelg. The OE. gloss was in the eighth century a perfectly natural spelling for *edtelg*, a re-dyeing; a word which has not been found, but which is regularly formed, and may very well have existed. This interpretation, however, found no acceptance, because it was not known that *rediniua* had any sense that could be supposed to have been rendered by the OE. word. But it was pointed out by Dr. Schlutter in Wölflin's *Archiv für lat. Lexicographie*, vol. xiii., p. 288, that the Corpus gloss refers to Aldhelm 19³⁰, where virginity is compared to purple, widowhood to cloth re-dyed after wear (*rediniua*), and wedded purity to plain wool (*lana*). How rare the word *rediniua* was in this sense may be seen from the fact that the glossator of MS. Digby 146 had to guess at its meaning from the context. He perceived

that it mu
and plain
is an Ald
MGH. edi
writer. T
it would s
in this spe
in the sup
spelling o
having un
branch, an

I will
some scho
glosses in
I believe,
be dated
is unquest
has been p
the Epina
which the
forms in t
which, if t
compelled
English.
developme
of the arc
there is n
not surpris
glosses in
The argum
evidence
are bound
the verdict
of the inv
the assum
dence—the
of Aldhel
Aldhelm v
popularity
value as
the autho
really of t
caused se
were writ

that it must denote some kind of cloth intermediate in value between purple and plain wool, and he therefore glossed it by *linum*. The proof that R 122 is an Aldhelm gloss is not affected by the fact (pointed out by Ehwald in the *MGH.* edition) that the whole passage of Aldhelm is a quotation from an older writer. This writer, by the way, has *noua purpura* instead of *purpura*, whence it would seem that *rediuina* is merely an adjective; and it is quite possible that in this specific sense it was never used in any other instance. Professor Toller, in the supplement to the A.S. Dictionary, actually perceived that the normalized spelling of *aettaelg* would be *edtelg*, and quoted the Aldhelm passage; but having unfortunately not seen Schlutter's note, he derived *edtelg* from *telga*, a branch, and rendered it by 'what springs up again without sowing.'

I will now refer to certain serious chronological difficulties, which have rendered some scholars unwilling to admit the possibility of the existence of Aldhelm glosses in the Corpus Glossary, or at any rate in its earliest stratum. It is, I believe, the unanimous verdict of palaeographers that the Corpus MS. cannot be dated later than the middle of the eighth century. But the Corpus Glossary is unquestionably a remodelled and enlarged edition of the earlier work which has been preserved in the Epinal and the First Erfurt Glossary. Now although the Epinal and Erfurt MSS. are later than the Corpus MS., the forms in which the OE. words occur in them are very much more archaic than the forms in the Corpus Glossary; in fact, very often they are precisely the forms which, if these two MSS. had not been preserved, our philologists would have been compelled to give with an asterisk as the inferred forms in prehistoric Old English. At least a generation or two, one would say, must be allowed for the developments in the phonology and spelling of the language between the date of the archetype of Epinal and Erfurt and the date of the Corpus MS. Yet there is no doubt that Aldhelm died in A.D. 709. In view of these facts, it is not surprising that some philologists have thought that the existence of Aldhelm glosses in the archetype of Epinal and Erfurt was antecedently impossible. The argument, however plausible, of course becomes valueless if the positive evidence I have offered is trustworthy. But the question remains whether we are bound to bring down the accepted date of the Corpus MS., or whether the verdict of the palaeographers can in any way be reconciled with the results of the investigations of the present article. I believe it can be so reconciled, on the assumption—unsupported indeed, but also uncontradicted, by any evidence—that the archetype of Epinal and Erfurt was compiled in the school of Aldhelm at Malmesbury, and perhaps under his personal superintendence. Aldhelm was above all things a schoolmaster; his writings owed their immense popularity far less to the desire for spiritual edification than to their supposed value as a storehouse of exquisite Latinity; indeed, I strongly suspect that the author (though he may not have confessed as much even to himself) was really of the same mind as his readers. It seems not unlikely that he may have caused several of his pupils to make transcripts of his works as soon as they were written, and have encouraged them to gloss their copies, as a useful part

of their course of study. Indeed, he may sometimes even have helped them with the interpretation of difficult words: the general correctness of the Aldhelm renderings in Epinal, as compared with the frequent blundering of later glossators, seems to suggest that the information may have been derived from the fountain head.

It will be obvious that in any future investigation of the sources of the individual Corpus glosses the Aldhelmian element will have to be taken carefully into account. Every instance of coincidence between a Corpus lemma and a word occurring in Aldhelm's text must be registered, and its value determined in accordance with the special circumstances of the case. If the lemma is in an inflexional form, which must have come from some glossed text, and if it is found with the required meaning in Aldhelm, and not in any other of the texts known to have furnished material to the glossarist, then—subject only to the fallibility of all human inferences—we may safely conclude that Aldhelm was the source. If, again, the lemma appears in a well-marked Aldhelm batch either in Epinal-Erfurt or in the additions in Corpus, the conclusion will be equally certain. If, on the other hand, we find it in a batch (e.g.) of unquestionable Virgil, Orosius, or Bible glosses, then we must refer it to the source thus indicated. There are, however, not a few instances in which at first sight two different sources appear equally probable. Take, for example, B 118 'Biothanatas: seolfbonan' (i.e. self-murderers). In Chapter XXXI. of the *De Virginitate*, Aldhelm says that unless the obligation of preserving chastity is held to override all other obligations, the man who takes his own life because the only alternative is to commit a sin against purity 'inter biothanatas reputabitur.' (The reading *biothanatas* is found in all MSS., though the editors have substituted the normal *biothanatos*.) This at first sight looks decisive. But Aldhelm borrowed the expression from Cassianus, who, speaking of a fanatic monk who in an access of religious frenzy had thrown himself into the water, and died in consequence, says that but for his known holiness of life he would have been, 'inter biothanatos reputatus,' deprived of the honours due to the faithful departed. We seem therefore to have two possible sources for this item, and the criterion of position in the glossary fails us here. But in the first place the coincidence in form is remarkable, as the apparatus of the critical edition of Cassianus shows no alternative to *biothanatos*. Very likely Aldhelm, knowing that the word was Greek, and misled by plausible Greek analogies, imagined that it ought to be of the first declension. In the second place, while we know that Aldhelm glosses were used freely by the Corpus redactor, I am not aware that he has incorporated any glosses on Cassianus. In this instance, therefore, I should decide in favour of Aldhelm. A similar question arises with regard to I 196, 'In transmigrationem: in foernisse.' Aldhelm (22²¹) has in *transmigratione*, and as Epinal (though not Erfurt) gives the lemma with the ablative, the discrepancy in the inflexion need not greatly trouble us. But the phrase occurs also in Orosius ('plurimos Iudaeorum in *transmigrationem* egit,' III. vii. 6), and as both Epinal and Corpus have this entry in a distinct Orosius group, one

of the mo
to Aldhel
with the s
Virgil, or
special re

1.—(C
type of E
which cor
Hessels, A
would se
intended
it into his
had been
middle, w
that six c
lated, or
tion will s

C 77 {
S 466 {
T 210 {

These lin
spelling, v
yield the
The first
MS. (dou
what reas
unmeanin
the alphab
incomplete
margin, a
purum sa
order; but
in the cop
the two la

2.—(C
acantum,

¹ The num
those of the
Glossary (ec

² So Epinal

of the most striking apparent examples of the debt of the archetypal collection to Aldhelm glosses must be abandoned as fallacious. When a lemma is found, with the sense indicated by the gloss, both in Aldhelm and in Orosius, Rufinus, Virgil, or the Bible, the earlier source is the more probable, unless there is some special reason for deciding otherwise.

II.—EMENDATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS.

1.—(*Jewel names*) I have discovered that one of the sources of the archetype of Epinal, Erfurt, and Corpus must have been a non-alphabetical glossary which contained six lines practically identical with Leiden XLI. 9-16 (see Hessels, *Leiden Glossary*), except that No. 12 (*sardius*) was omitted and (it would seem) inserted by an afterthought in the margin. These lines were intended to be read straight across the page; but the alphabetical compiler took it into his head that they were to be read in two columns. (Possibly the page had been originally meant to be in two columns, and a line ruled down the middle, which the scribe disregarded.) The result of this misunderstanding is that six of the seven glosses appear in the alphabetical glossaries either mutilated, or with irrelevant additions, or both together. The following reconstruction will show what has happened: ¹

C 77	{	Calcidon ut ignis lucens.	Smaragdus uiridem colorem habet	S 378
		hoc est prasinum. Sar	donix habet calorem sanguinis,	S 82
S 466	{	qui est onichinus.	Crisolitus auri colorem et stellas	C 886
		luculentas habet.	Byrillus tantum ² ut aqua resplendet	B 97
T 210	{	Topazion ut aurum micat.	Cyprassus ³ uiridem habet colorem,	{ C 977
		ut est porrus,	et stellas aureas habet.	

These lines, read straight across, coincide, except for slight differences of spelling, with what we find in the Leiden Glossary. Read in two columns, they yield the nonsensical explanations that occur in the three alphabetical glossaries. The first syllabus of *Sardonix* was corrupted into *Ser*; the scribe of the Erfurt MS. (doubtless following his predecessor) wrote the letter *p* underneath, for what reason I am unable to guess. Hence in Epinal and Corpus we have the unmeaning entry 'Sper, qui est onichinus, luculentas habet.' The compiler of the alphabetical glossary, without correcting this blunder, added the correct but incomplete reading 'Sardonix habet colorem sanguinis,' and also (from the margin, as I have suggested above) the entry Leiden No. 12, 'Sardius, colorem purum sanguinis.' The list is taken from Apoc. xxii., and follows the Bible order; but it is odd that the first two items, *iaspis* and *sapphirus* were omitted in the copy used by the alphabetical compiler, though preserved in Leiden, and the two last, *hyacinthus* and *amethystus*, are missing in all four glossaries.

2.—(A 172) Accintu: denetle. *Accintu* is certainly a scribal error for *acantum*, and *denetle* is the OE. *netle* (nettle, accusative), with some mutilated

¹ The numbers attached to the half-lines are those of the corresponding entries in the Corpus Glossary (ed. Hessels).

² So Epinal; Corpus omits the word; Leiden

according to Hessels, has a contraction for *tamen*.

³ For *Chrysoprasus*.

word prefixed. Compare the Old High German and Old Low German glosses in Diefenbach: 'Acantum nesselsame' (nettle-seed); 'Acantum, netele, netelsat' (nettle, nettle-seed). The notion that *acanthus* meant some kind of nettle (the seed of which was used in pharmacy) appears elsewhere; e.g. in the following glosses:

'Acantum est semen urticae; multum est laxatium' (*Sinonoma Barth.* ed. Mowat, p. 9).

'Achalaphe, ygia, acanturie uel acantum, urtica pungens, idem' (*Alphita*, ed. Mowat, p. 1).

'Acanthis aegyptiaca, semen urticae' (*Glosses of P. de Abano* in Appendix to *Alphita*, ed. Mowat).

What the prefixed syllable in *denette* can be is doubtful. There is an English word *dea-nettle*, recorded from the sixteenth century onwards, which Murray (see O.E.D., s.v.) thinks cannot be identified etymologically with the synonymous 'dead nettle.' (It is applied locally to several distinct plants.) It is barely possible that it may have come down from the OE. period, and that our gloss is an example of it. Much more likely, however, is the supposition that some letters have been lost before *-de*. *Reade netle*, 'red nettle,' is a plant name that occurs several times in OE. writings. But it seems to me more probable that we should read < *sticien* > *de netle*, the exact equivalent of *urtica pungens* in the gloss quoted above from *Alphita*.

3.—(A 483) Alites: challes. Read 'Aliter: alio, elles.' The letters *ali* could easily be misread as *ch*, and *oe*, in the English hand of the eighth century, closely resembles *a*. The OE. *elles* glosses *aliter* in the Digby MS. of Aldhelm.

4.—Amineae: sine rubore. A pseudo-etymological interpretation, taken from Servius ad Verg. *Geo.* II. 97: 'Amineum uinum dictum est, quasi sine minio, id est rubore, nam album est' (Virgil, *Ammineae uites*).

5.—(A 536) Amilarius: mearh (=horse). Read 'admissarius.'

6.—B 55) Baruina: barriggae. B 196 Braugina: barice. I suspect that these lemmata are corruptions of *bargina*, which is twice used by Aldhelm (180¹⁴ and 194²³, though Giles, following earlier editors, substitutes *pagina*, which makes no sense; in the former place Cleop. glosses it *ða elðeodigan*, 'the foreigners'). What the word really meant is not easy to discover from the examples in the *Thesaurus*, but a gloss there quoted calls it *βαρβαρικὴ προσφώνησις*. Aldhelm apparently had got hold of some descendants of the gloss, for he apparently uses the word for the adverb *barbarice*. A gloss 'barbarice' seems to have lost its first syllable (perhaps because it coincided with the first syllable of the lemma), thus yielding the 'barice' of B 196. A scribe supposed *barice* to be an English noun with the feminine agent-suffix, and normalized the spelling to *barriggae*, as in B 55.

7.—(B 165) Bouestra: radre. It is with great hesitation that I give what will be deemed (perhaps rightly) a too adventurous explanation of this obscure item. The OE. gloss can hardly be anything but *radore*, 'in the firmament.' Now in Cleop. (WW. 523²⁹) we find a gloss 'Vetre: radores,' where *uetre*

stands for
'in the fir
I suggest
written ov
that in his
the nomini

8.—(C
colobii ic
facsimile o
he will s
Callicula
ambiuntur
simply 'fr
it by *sign*
ment on a
called 'co
that the u
probably s
be doubt

9.—(C
castra (A
context ad
which the
a line; th
guessed it

10.—(C
this gloss
muscles.'
plant). A
suspect th
ignored m
and sugg
obvious a
sufficient c

11.—(C
12.—(C
where Gil
The word
'playing t
affect bray
the senses
examples)
the word,
stem *drū*

stands for *aethrae* in Aldhelm's text (164¹¹). A possible Latin expression for 'in the firmament' would be *globo astrorum* (cf. *globus astrorum*, Aldh. 277²²). I suggest that the compiler of the Corpus Glossary found the gloss *radore* written over (*glo*)*bo astrorum*; that he read the lemma as *bouestrorum*; and that in his glossary he changed the supposed genitive of a *plurale tantum* into the nominative, retaining the OE. gloss as it stood.

8.—(C 256) Caluiale: cosobricases. I propose to read: 'Callicul<a>e: colobii icones.' If the reader will write out the words in the script of the facsimile of the Corpus MS., only using the upright f instead of the wriggled s, he will see that there is no palaeographical difficulty in the emendation. *Callicula* occurs in Aldhelm 77¹⁵: 'calliculae [v.l. galliculae] rubricatis pellibus ambiuntur.' In Ælfric's Glossary the word is rendered by *rocc*, which means simply 'frock' or 'tunic'; but an ancient gloss quoted in Du Cange explains it by *signum uestis*. Apparently *signum* denotes some sort of pictorial ornament on a garment, and from Du Cange s.v. *Colobium* it appears that the robe called 'colobium' was sometimes adorned with 'signa.' It seems to me certain that the unmeaning 'cosobricases' must represent *colobii* followed by some word, probably synonymous with *signa*; whether I am right in conjecturing *icones* may be doubted.

9.—(C 295) Cereacas: recessus. The lemma is evidently Virgil's *cerea castra* (*Aen.* XII. 589) which Aldhelm echoes in 4². Perhaps the Virgilian context accounts better than Aldhelm's for the gloss 'recessus.' The MS. in which the gloss was first written presumably had *castra* divided at the end of a line; the glossator seems to have taken *cereacas* for a complete word, and guessed its meaning from the context.

10.—(D 294) Digitalium musculorum: fingirdoccana. On the ground of this gloss, the A.S. Dictionaries have an entry '*Finger-doccan*, pl., finger-muscles.' But *docce* is unknown in the sense of 'muscle'; it means 'dock' (the plant). *Finger-doccan* would be a very likely name for the foxglove; and I suspect the glossator took *digitalium* for a substantive with this meaning, and ignored *musculorum*. The botanical name *Digitalis* for the foxglove is modern, and suggested by the German name *Fingerhut*. But *digitale*, 'thimble,' is so obvious a designation for the plant that we may reasonably take this gloss as sufficient evidence for its existence in the Latin of the seventh century.

11.—(E 106) Eliscium, greciae. Read 'Elis: ciū [i.e. *ciuitas*] Graeciae.'

12.—(I 77) Indruticans: wraestende. The lemma occurs in Aldhelm 17³⁷, where Giles, against all the MSS., substitutes *infruticans*, which makes no sense. The word, of which this seems to be the only known example, means 'flaunting,' 'playing the fop,' and is correctly rendered here by *wraestende* (*wraestan*, to affect bravery or splendour, from the adj. *wrast*, *wraest*, gallant, exquisite, fine; the senses of the adj. given in Sweet's Dictionary do not agree with the examples). Cleop. has the same gloss; but the later glossators did not know the word, and guess at random. The word is derived from the Romanic stem *drūt-*, *drūd-*, gallant, brave, handsome, beloved, etc.; cf. Old French *dru*,

It. *drudo*, etc. The normal form of *indruticare* in O.F. would be *endrugier*; I do not find this, but Godefroy has *drugier* (<*druticāre*). See Schlutter in Wölfflin's *Archiv f. lat. Lexicographie*, xiii. 287; he refers to the Old Irish *drúth*, but this according to the Celtists is a loan-word from Romanic. The Romanic stem is probably of Germanic origin.

13.—(I 270) *Inedia*: stupore dentium. Hessels, whose diplomatic edition of the Corpus Glossary is a marvel of accuracy, and who rarely transgresses into textual criticism, has for once made a bad blunder in suggesting the word-division *stupor edentium*. For *stupor dentium* is a medical term, occurring a score of times in the Latin translation of Galen, as the rendering of *αἰμωδία*. ('a scorbutic affection of the gums,' L. and Sc.). It also occurs in the Vulgate (Amos iv. 6) for the 'setting on edge' of the teeth, so often mentioned in Hebrew prophecy. Here the LXX has *γομφιασμόν ὀδόντων*; but in the book of Jeremiah the verb corresponding to this meaning is *αἰμωδιᾶν* (Vulgate *obstupescere*). An English writer of 1607 has 'stupidity of the teeth'!

But *stupor dentium*, whether in the technical or the popular sense, does not seem a very appropriate rendering for *inedia*. There is something here that requires explanation. A convincing solution of the puzzle was given to me in conversation by Prof. J. A. Smith, who pointed out that *inedia* must have been a scribe's conjectural emendation for *emodia*, the natural late Latin transliteration for *αἰμωδία*. The scribe deserves some credit for his cleverness in hitting upon a common Latin word so much like the unintelligible *emodia* in shape, and having a meaning that had something to do with his teeth. Perhaps the source of this gloss may be found in some Bible commentator who quoted the Greek word.

14.—(L 93) *Ladascapiae*: briensis, id est hondwurm. As *hondwurm* ('hand-worm') means the itch insect, it seems natural to guess that *-scapiae* is some sort of corruption of *scabies*. Perhaps *latā scabie* may have occurred in some prose passage alluding to Verg. *Geo.* III. 299 ('glacies ne frigida laedat molle pecus, *scabiemque ferat*') and have been mistaken for a plural noun. Confusion of name between the disease of sheep and that of human beings would, I suppose, be natural enough.

15.—(M 40) *Melito*: meditor, meadrobordan. *Melito* is obviously *μελετω*. Hessels marks *meadrobordan* with an asterisk as an OE. gloss, but it is really a separate entry, 'M<a>ea<n>dro: bordan' (i.e. 'with a border'). This is clearly a Virgil gloss; see *Aen.* V. 251.

16.—(M 183) *Melfoben*; *musa. mane mea e greco*. Shall we read *manu mea*, and take the words as a remark of the scribe: 'Added by my hand from the Greek'? If this is the explanation, the scribe had little cause for boasting in his rendering of *Melpomene*. The Erfurt Glossary has 'Melboren: musa.'

17.—(P 188) *Partica*: reodnaesc. The lemma has been supposed to be a mistake for *pertica*, whence *reodnaesc* is (with a query) rendered 'perch' in the first edition of Clark Hall's A.S. Dictionary. But *partica* is for *Parthica*, Parthian or Persian leather, and *reodnaesc* means 'red leather.' This was partly

explained
followed S
and naes
etymologi

18.—

Hessels pr
to disting
rotum, as
Latin wor

19.—

is correct,

20.—

sceabb (= 'Scara, cru
is plausibl
(for *densit*
it is eviden
the Epina
the gloss
Verg. *Geo.*

21.—

(as old as
walcyrgae
appears in
and *Simus*
of six min
by *E*; and
when carele

22.—

written *ua*
turnitatis
speech to t

23.—

less beast')

24.—

(ignum):
that the le
Geo. I. 367,

25.—

with the sa
iuscellum,

26.—

has been m
of glosses,

explained by Napier (in note to OE. Glosses, I. 5324), who, however, wrongly followed Schlutter in the suggestion that *-naesc* is a mistake for *-laesc*. *Laesc* and *naesc* both are well authenticated words denoting a kind of leather, and are etymologically distinct.

18.—(R 215) Rotnum: nabogar. The gloss means 'an auger.' Sweet and Hessels print *rotnum*, but Wright-Wülcker *rottrum*; the letters *r* and *n* are hard to distinguish in this MS. I think the scribe must have intended to write *rottrum*, as the word seems to be a truncation of *taratrum*, a common mediaeval Latin word for 'auger.'

19.—(S 283) Serion: inepte. Erfurt has 'inepte uel discrete.' Perhaps this is correct, and the original lemma was *loco serione*.

20.—(S 173) Scara: scaed. In Bosworth-Toller's A.S. Dictionary s.v. *sceabb* (= modern Eng. *scab*), the lemma is explained by reference to Du Cange. 'Scara, crusta uulneris,' and *scaed* is treated as a scribal error for *scaeb*. This is plausible, but wrong. For the Erfurt Glossary has 'Scara: arborum tensitas' (for *densitas*), and the Epinal Glossary 'Sacra: orborum (*sic*) densitas.' Hence it is evident that *scaed* is correct, and means 'shade.' I have little doubt that the Epinal reading *sacra* is the right one, and that here (as often happened) the gloss has been attached to the wrong word in the text, which is probably Verg. *Geo.* III. 334, 'sacrā . . . umbrā.'

21.—(S 379) Smus: wellyrgae. I have no doubt that this is a misreading (as old as the compilation of the archetypal glossary) for *Erinis* (= *Erinnys*): *walcyrgae* (= *Valkyrie*). The same gloss, with another spelling of the lemma, appears in E 351, 'Eurytis: walcyrge.' In the script of the Corpus MS. *Erinis* and *Simus* (the reading of the Erfurt MS.) are very much alike; both consist of six minims followed by *s* and preceded in the case by *s*, and in the other by *E*; and *S* and *E* are sufficiently alike for the one to be misread for the other when carelessly written.

22.—(S 641) Sualdam: durhere. Of course the lemma is for *ualuam* (often written *ualbam*). The prefixed *s* may be due to some such context as 'taci-turnitatis *ualbam* reserando,' Aldhelm's grandiloquent phrase (42¹) for giving speech to the dumb.

23.—(S 701) Suae der butan toðum. This is an OE. gloss (= 'like a toothless beast') that has lost its lemma.

24.—(T 311) Tractibus: naescum. Read *raescum*, and compare 'imbribus (*ignium*): raescum' in Napier OE. Glosses. From the gloss it would appear that the lemma is taken from some passage alluding to or imitating Verg. *Geo.* I. 367, 'Flammarum longos a tergo albescere tractus.'

25.—(V 208) Viscellum: broht. The OE. gloss is a misspelling for *broth*, with the same meaning as in modern English; and the lemma is a mistake for *iuscellum*, a well-authenticated word.

26.—(V 222) Vistula: suge sward. Although a very different suggestion has been made by a scholar who has done valuable work in the interpretation of glosses, I think there can be no reasonable doubt that the OE. words mean

a sow's 'sward' or skin. If so, *uistula* cannot be for *fstula* in any known sense. Can it be a blundered rendering of (*s*) *uis cuticula*? Or does it represent a Vulgar Latin **ustula*, from *ustulare* to singe (a swine)?

The corruptions in the Corpus Glossary are innumerable. I have endeavoured in this article to confine myself strictly to those of which the correction is not extremely obvious and has not already been proposed. It is only too likely that I may have sometimes overlooked a published conjecture identical with or preferable to one of my own. If so, I can only express my regret, and plead in excuse that I have had no time to search through the many learned periodicals in which articles on the subject may be found.

HENRY BRADLEY.

POSTSCRIPT.—Since the above was in type, and too late for any extensive corrections to be made, I have become convinced by evidence kindly furnished to me by Professor W. M. Lindsay of the unsoundness of the argument on which I principally relied as proving that the archetypal glossary (as distinguished from the additions made by the redactor of Corpus) contained a large number of Aldhelm glosses. I still see reasons for believing, though with diminished confidence, that a few such glosses do exist in Epinal-Erfurt. My proof that there is a large Aldhelmian element in the latest stratum of the glossary remains unaffected. I wish now to reinforce it by citing the following additional example of a Corpus gloss, otherwise unaccountable, which can be convincingly explained by a reference to its source in Aldhelm's text:—

U 162. Viriuola: maritalis complexus. The plausible guess that *uiriuola* is a feminine adjective from *uir* and *uola* is erroneous. The source is clearly Aldhelm 21⁹⁰: 'angulari duorum testamentorum lapide de collis cacumine sine uiri uola hoc est maritali complexu absciso.' Aldhelm regarded 'the stone cut from the mountain without hands' of Dan. ii. 34 as an allegory of Christ. For the *sine manibus* of the Vulgate he substituted *sine uola* as being less commonplace Latin, and inserted *uiri* in the interest of the allegory.

H. B.

Athen

Luigi

Adduces a
was situated
coast-line
A Latin p

Athen

R. Sc

Herakles,
animistic
by local w
he thinks
ing the e
arrives at
Greek Reli
work of c
natural pl
pleads for
out origins

C. Pa

one of 'ad
a new, or
tional (as i
and in a p
sense, wh
emendax.'
on the cod
new scribe
that perio
strict sens
the poems

VI. 4

The e

Book I., a
in the cha
nursing hi
poetaster,
Epicurus!
candidly c
advantage
Horace, th
Ode 33 is i

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

Atene e Roma. XXI. July, Aug., Sep., 1918.

Luigi Pernier, *Luigi Savignoni and his Work*. Luigi Pareti, *Portus Lunae*. Adduces ancient and medieval testimony in great detail to prove that the harbour was situated at the mouth of the Macra, not in the Gulf of Spezia. Changes in the coast-line have obliterated its traces. R. Melani, *In Alpibus, huiusce Tempore Belli*. A Latin poem. Obituary notice: Friedrich Hauser (C. Albizzati).

Athenaeum (Pavia). VI. 3. 1918.

R. Schiava attacks the hypothesis that the heroes of the adventurer-class (e.g. Herakles, Perseus, Jason) are to be traced back to divinities. He accepts the animistic origin of many heroes of other types; others he thinks are to be explained by local worship of dead warriors, often protectors of their cities. This latter class he thinks may have been confused with obscure local deities. After briefly reviewing the early theories of C. O. Müller, Max Müller, and others of later date, he arrives at the point of view taken by Dr. Jane Harrison in *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. With certain exceptions he would attribute heroic legends to the work of creative imagination, and holds that the god-myths reflect not so much natural phenomena as human social conditions and mentality. In conclusion he pleads for more elasticity in interpreting and classifying manifestations and searching out origins.

C. Pascal supports Inzerillo as to the double meaning of *emendare*, (1) a wider one of 'adding to,' or 'annotating,' and (2) a narrower one of producing or publishing a new, or republishing an old work. In the sense of 'correcting' its use is exceptional (as in the 'emending' by Valerius Cato of the verses of Lucilius [Hor. *Sat.* X.], and in a passage in Pliny's *Letters* V. 12, 2). Pliny more often uses *corrigeré* in this sense, when some critic has perhaps played the part of Dr. Verrall's 'splendid emendax.' For its use in the sense of restoring an original text he quotes the work on the codices of Livy's first decade. The work on books 3, 4, 5 was taken up by a new scribe, Nicomachus Dexter, who had a second codex before him, so that over that period the clerical errors of the Veronese codex escaped correction. In the strict sense of 'publishing,' *emendare* is used in the passage from St. Hieronymus on the poems of Lucretius, 'quos postea Cicero emendauit.'

VI. 4. 1918.

The editor discusses Horace, *Epistles* I. 4, connecting it with the 33rd Ode of Book I., and ridicules the frequent interpretations given to it, which find Horace in the character of a cynical man of the world, consoling a love-lorn poet who is nursing his grievances in a lonely forest, composing elegies in competition with a poetaster, and who is to be consoled by paying a visit to a sleek follower of Epicurus! P. finds in the little poem mainly irony addressed to Tibullus, who had candidly criticized his Satires and was ostensibly a Stoic, but one who had all the advantages of Epicurean prosperity. And this austere friend will come and call him, Horace, the little pig in the sty of Epicurus. The Albius addressed here and in Ode 33 is identified with Tibullus.

Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1918.

Oct. 5. F. Fügner, *Des Titus Livius Römische Geschichte seit Gründung der Stadt*. Im Auszuge hrsg. von F. F. (R. Berndt). In his notice of some volumes of this school book the reviewer gives a full account of the *Hilfsheft* (dritte verbesserte Auflage, bearb. von A. Rosenberg, pp. 140), which will be useful to all students of Livy. R. has a thorough knowledge of recent work on the subject and has rewritten much of the book, including the introduction to the first Decade, the chapters on Livy's sources, and on the historical importance of the Second Punic War.

Oct. 12. J. Sitzler, *Ein ästhetischer Kommentar zu Homers Odyssee*. Dritte verb. Aufl. (Ziehen). The changes in the new edition are not very important. W. Bannier contributes to this number a paper *Zu griechischen Inschriften*.

Oct. 19. J. Steinthal, *De interpolationibus Plantinis* (Klotz). The reviewer discusses the value of the linguistic tests which, with the help of the *Thesaurus*, the author applies to suspected passages. *Publications of Princeton University*. Archaeological expedition to Syria. Division II.: *Ancient Architecture in Syria*, by H. C. Butler. Division III.: *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria*, by E. Littmann and D. Magie (Hiller v. Gaertringen). The reviewer sketches the contents. E. Herdi, *Die Herstellung und Verwertung von Käse im griechisch-römischen Altertum* (Keller). Elaborate and thorough. A. Klamp contributes to this number a paper on the text of Tacitus, *Dialogus*, 6, 9 sqq. He proposes to read *quam quae diu servantur for quamquam alia diu servantur*.

Oct. 26. R. Herkenrath, *Die Handlung in Sophokles' Philoktet und ihr Bühnengott Herakles* (Bucherer). Deepens our understanding of the play. G. A. Harrer, *Consules suffecti in the years 98 to 101* (Liebenam). The reviewer gives a summary of the literature on the subject. E. M. Pridik, *Inventar-Katalog der Stempel auf Henkeln und Hülsen von Amphoren und auf Ziegeln*. Eremitagesammlung. With illustrations (F. Hiller v. Gaertringen). This book, which is written in Russian, is highly praised. A. Kurfess contributes a paper on the text of Cic. *De Imp. Pomp.* § 18, § 24, and § 57.

Nov. 2. G. Körte, *Göttinger Bronzen*. With illustrations (Pagenstecher). Of some value for tracing the influence of Etruria on Rome. W. Soltau contributes an article on the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*.

Nov. 9. V. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Handzeichen* (Weinberger). Supplements Gardthausen's *Griech. Pal.*

Nov. 16. M. Schuster, *Zur Deutung des Arriusepigramms* (Helm). The point of the epigram (Catullus 84) is that Arrius tries to speak in an old-fashioned way, but does it badly. A. Engelbrecht, *Zur Sprache des Hilarius Pictaviensis und seiner Zeitgenossen* (Tolkiehn). The writer has a thorough knowledge of patristic literature. E. Müller-Graupa contributes to this and the two following numbers an interesting study of certain uses of the Infinitive, especially in German and Latin, entitled *Der Infinitivus 'Primitivus'*. The main point of the paper is well expressed in the words of Wagner (*Quaest. Verg.* IV. 642): 'Antiquis temporibus verbo nondum per tempora modosque digesto solo utebantur infinitivo; quae ratio loquendi ut est balbutientis infantiae, ita hodieque invenitur apud populos quosdam rudes et barbaros; retenta interdum illa quidem etiam a cultioribus populis.'

Nov. 23. Th. Langenmaier, *Lexikon zur alten Geographie des südöstlichen Äquatorialafrika* (Philipp). Based on the writer's dissertation 'Alte Kenntnis und Kartographie der zentralafrikanischen Seenregion.' IX. *Bericht der Römisch-germanischen Kommission*, 1916 (Anthes).

Classical Weekly (New York). 1918.

Nov. 18. Cagnat and Chapot, *Manuel d'Archéologie Romaine*. Tome Premier (D. M. Robinson). 'There is no good handbook covering the whole field of Roman

archaeology.
Coinage 700

have appear

Dec.

additions to

Dec. 1

'One of the

neither liter

and with th

1919.

Irrigation as

give little c

passages I

Latin writ

from Colum

Jan. 20

Introduction

compact an

citation of l

J. F. D'Alt

'This work

single volum

Rasseg

N. Fes

discrepanci

as well as t

Conradt, an

with indicat

itself. Dio

frequent div

to that of t

But the que

material?

used as sign

book contain

F. suppose

venience, a

successively

apparent co

criticisms a

previous bo

I. 20, 21; a

I. 2.

G. Pas

the general

frequent oc

repetition o

rhetorical c

they were

instruction,

Aristotle, T

archaeology as this publication will cover it.' Percy Gardner, *A History of Ancient Coinage* 700-300 B.C. (D. M. Robinson). 'One of the most important books which have appeared in recent years in the field of classical archaeology.'

Dec. 2. In this and two following numbers C. K. reviews briefly some recent additions to the Loeb Library.

Dec. 16. R. C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama* (D. M. Robinson). 'One of the most scholarly books in recent years on a classical subject. . . . It is neither literary nor strictly archaeological, but rather deals with dramatic technique and with the technical background and environment of the Greek drama.'

1919. Jan. 6. C. K. contributes to this and the next number a paper on *Irrigation among the Greeks and the Romans*. He points out that books of reference give little or no help on the subject. 'It seems worth while, therefore, to group passages I have found in ordinary reading in which reference is made by Greek or Latin writers to irrigation, and to combine with these a few additional passages, from *Columella* and the *Digest*, supplied by Pauly-Wissowa.'

Jan. 20. *Faustus Andrelinus and Joannes Arnolletus, The Eclogues of*, ed. with Introduction and Notes by W. P. Mustard (D. P. Lockwood). 'He gives us a compact and documented biography of each author, a sound text, and an exhaustive citation of literary parallels, particularly passages borrowed from the ancient authors.' J. F. D'Alton, *Horace and his Age, a study in historical background* (W. B. McDaniel). 'This work meets the needs of the ordinary reader of Horace better than any other single volume known to the reviewer.'

Rassegna Italiana. I. 1. 1918.

N. Festa, in a treatise on the publication of Thucydides' *History*, discusses the discrepancies among the notes of the scholiasts referring to the divisions into books, as well as the variations of numbers and letters used for numeration. Wilamowitz, Conradt, and Hude, viewing the question from another point of view, were concerned with indications in the Cod. Vat. F. discusses the internal evidence of the *History* itself. Diodorus speaks of nine books, and it is suggested that the earlier and more frequent division into eight may have been changed in order to bring the number up to that of the volumes of Herodotus, which would have been beside it in collections. But the question of greater importance is: How did the author himself divide his material? Marcellinus and the scholiasts speak of thirteen books. The formula used as signature occurs twelve times (the Introduction not being 'signed'). Each book contained one year of the war, except β and θ , which cover two years each, and F. supposes the author published them 'seriatim' as he wrote them. For convenience, and to equalise approximately the length of the books, they were successively regrouped into eight and nine volumes. His explanation of some of the apparent contradictions is that Thucydides, as he published the sections, received criticisms and suggestions which made him revise and expand certain passages in previous books (e.g. contrast the expulsion of the Peisistratids in VI. 54-59 with I. 20, 21; also cf. the justification of his chronological methods in V. 20 with II. 1).

I. 2. 1918.

G. Pasquali maintains that the *Characters* of Theophrastus were not written for the general public, being, according to classical standards, unfinished in form. The frequent occurrence of the hiatus, the lack of elegance in structure and the tiresome repetition of formulae have led to the supposition that they were to be used in rhetorical courses, that they were a collection of material for comic actors, or that they were 'illustrations' to be used in connexion with the author's systematic ethical instruction, or incorporated in a large work. P.'s suggestion is that, like his master Aristotle, Theophrastus was wont to use lecture-notes, left in the rough, but

elaborated here and there, βιβλία ἀνέκδοτα to be withheld from circulation as long as they were useful in attracting the more lucrative pupil. His reputation for wit would attract a larger audience who would find amusement, while the more serious student of ethics would find teaching. This P. thinks may account for the apparent repetition of similar characters—versions perhaps revised and remodelled to fit them for use in various lectures on ethical subjects. (*To be continued.*)

Revue de Philologie. XLII. 2. 1918.

L. Havet, *Proprius, Terme rituel*. In *Plaut. Capt.* 862 and elsewhere it means that the victim has been fed up to the very moment of sacrifice, and is in prime condition and fit to be offered to the gods. F. Cumont, *Ecrits Hermétiques: II. Le médecin Thessalus et les plantes astrales d'Hermès Trismégiste*. M. Badolle, *La date d'avènement de Ptolémée IV. Philopator*. The evidence of the papyri shows that Philopator probably came to the throne in September, 221. G. Mathieu, *Isocrate et Thucydide*. REVIEWS: *Washington University Studies* V. ed. F. W. Shipley. *Revue des revues et publications d'Académies relatives à l'antiquité classique*. These abstracts are carried to the end of 1917.

Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica. XLVI. 4. Oct., 1918.

Luigi Pareti, *More about the Taurini in the Time of Hannibal*. Recapitulates and defends against the strictures of De Sanctis his contention that Hannibal entered Italy by the Little St. Bernard [see *C.Q.* VI. (1912), p. 212]. Livy (XXI. 38. 6 sqq.) was misled through not knowing the wider significance of *Taurini*, which included the Salassi and the Lepontii. The capital of these Taurini (*Taurasia* in Appian), which Hannibal attacked, was not on the site of Turin or in its neighbourhood. The article discusses also the etymology of *Taurini* and of *Poeninus*. Remigio Sabbadini, *The Vergilian Codex F*. This illustrated MS. (No. 3225 in the Vatican Library) now contains only 75 leaves out of an original 420 or so, but it is more free from interpolations than any other codex of Vergil. The script belongs to the fourth or the fifth century. Many peculiarities of spelling indicate a Spanish origin. Umberto Moricca, *The Tragedies of Seneca* (another instalment; to be continued). Claims for Seneca a large measure of originality in the construction and development of his plots and in character-drawing. The thesis is supported by a detailed comparison with the Greek models, and is further illustrated by means of modern literature, e.g. Racine's *Andromaque*. Seneca's characters have more variety than those of Greek tragedy, and in the new touches which he introduces he shows a profound and sympathetic knowledge of the human heart. REVIEWS: G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, Vol. III. (U. Pedrolì). The work of De Sanctis need not fear comparison with its rivals in other countries. It is thoroughly up to date, and shows great sanity and penetration in its criticism of authorities. The author is to be congratulated on having refrained from all reference to the Great War. It would have been all too easy to bring together what seem to be striking parallelisms between the past and the present—'easy indeed, but misleading, and, above all, ill befitting the seriousness of scientific work.' Louise E. Matthaei, *Studies in Greek Tragedy* (G. Fraccaroli). This book 'penetrates into the heart and substance of the texts.' It is full of fine analysis and suggestive criticism, and is a delight to read. It does more than 'many sacks of tiresome erudition' to make Aeschylus and Euripides known to us. If there is anything to which one may take exception it is that in her criticism of Euripides the author seems occasionally, like Euripides himself, to over-emphasize the rational, as opposed to the emotional, element. [The editor mentions, with a regret which will be fully shared by English and American scholars, that the learned writer of this review has lost his life in a street accident. An obituary notice will appear in the next number.]

long as
for wit
serious
parent
t them

means
prime
II. Le
La dale
s that
ocrate et
Revue
These

8.
es and
entered
6 sqq.)
cluded
ppian),
rhood.
emigio
Vatican
s more
to the
origin.
inued).
pment
d com-
modern
y than
ows a
G. De
ed not
te, and
r is to
would
elisms
all, ill
Greek
of the
o read.
is and
on it is
ripides
[The
merican
cident.